

1 ROB BONTA
2 Attorney General of California
3 ANYA M. BINSACCA, State Bar No. 189613
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 KRISTIN A. LISKA, State Bar No. 315994
Deputy Attorney General
4 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
5 Telephone: (415) 510-3916
Fax: (415) 703-5480
6 E-mail: Kristin.Liska@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Defendants

7

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 SACRAMENTO DIVISION

11
12 **CHRISTOPHER KOHLS, et al.,**

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 **ROB BONTA, in His Official Capacity as**
16 **Attorney General of the State of California,**
17 **and SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in Her Official**
Capacity as California Secretary of State,

18 Defendants.

19 Case No. 2:24-cv-02527-JAM-CKD

20
21 **DECLARATION OF R. MICHAEL**
ALVAREZ IN SUPPORT OF
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

22 Date: August 5, 2025
23 Time: 1:00 p.m.
24 Dept: 6
25 Judge: The Honorable John A.
26 Mendez
27 Trial Date: Not Scheduled
28 Action Filed: 9/17/2024

1 I, R. Michael Alvarez, Ph.D., declare:

2 **Qualifications:**

3 1. I am the Flintridge Foundation Professor of Political and Computational Social
4 Science at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, California. I received my BA in
5 political science from Carleton College, and my MA and PhDs in political science from Duke
6 University. I have written scientific studies published in peer-reviewed journals and have
7 published numerous books on voting behavior, political campaigns, political communications,
8 election technology, election administration, political and statistical methodology, machine
9 learning, and artificial intelligence. I am a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and
10 Sciences and a Fellow of the Society for Political Methodology. My current curriculum vitae is
11 attached to this declaration as Exhibit 1.

12 2. I am the founding co-director of the Caltech Linde Center for Science, Society, and
13 Policy and am the co-director of the Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project.

14 3. I am the Principal Investigator of the Caltech 2024 Election Integrity Project. In that
15 role I have conducted various studies of election misinformation in the 2024 election, developed
16 artificial intelligence tools to pre-bunk election rumors, and led a series of online webinars with
17 election officials during the 2024 election discussing the election rumors and misinformation they
18 encountered during the 2024 election and how they dealt with election misinformation. In
19 January 2025, I organized a major international conference on election misinformation that was
20 held (online) at Caltech.

21 4. I have published research in peer reviewed journals about the causal effects of social
22 media platform's content moderation policies (MISDOOM 2023), and about the detection and
23 moderation of toxicity in competitive online multiplayer gaming (Frontiers in Computer Science
24 2024). I published a paper that discusses how generative artificial intelligence and large language
25 models are affecting political communications and campaigning (Frontiers in Political Science
26 2023). I have forthcoming research articles that use large language models to study incivility and
27 toxicity in communications among legislators (Journal of Politics 2025). My current research
28 involves using artificial intelligence to pre-bunk rumors and falsehoods.

1 **The Political Power of Visual Communications**

2 5. It is commonly said that “a picture is worth a thousand words.” Decades of research
3 have shown that adage is true in electoral politics. Early research showed that a candidate’s
4 visual appearance in photographs on campaign flyers provided information about a candidate’s
5 attributes, and those evaluations were then associated with election outcomes (Rosenberg et al.
6 1986), in particular in low-information elections (Banducci et al. 2008). Subsequent studies have
7 continued to show that people make important inferences and judgments about the competence of
8 political candidates after quickly viewing only the candidate’s facial image, and that these
9 inferences about competence are associated with election outcomes (Todorov et al. 2005). People
10 can also draw inferences about other traits like deceitfulness and perceived threat from the facial
11 images of political candidates (Mattes et al. 2010), and from manipulated images that removed
12 the candidate’s face (Spezio et al. 2012). Thus, research has shown that people draw important
13 cues and heuristics about political candidates from their visual representations and that these cues
14 and heuristics are used in their voting decision-making process.

15 6. Since political candidate images provide powerful cues for voters, candidates and
16 their campaigns may use technologies to manipulate their images or those of their opponents.
17 Not surprisingly, seminal research by Ansolabehere et al. (1994) showed that manipulating
18 television advertisements to make them negative can depress voter turnout, while other earlier
19 research found that manipulating political television advertisements can make them more
20 effective for the sponsoring candidate (Noggle and Kaid 2000).

21 7. The early research focused on manipulation techniques now called non-synthetic or
22 traditional manipulation of image and videos (Gerstner et al. 2021). An example would be using
23 a commonly-available software package like Adobe Photoshop to change the hairstyle of a
24 candidate in an image. While software to manipulate images and videos in traditional ways is
25 commonly available, non-synthetic manipulation is time-consuming and requires considerable
26 expertise. A robust research literature on the detection of altered digital images (digital images
27 forensics) has developed, offering many tools for detecting most forms of non-synthetic
28 manipulated visual images (Ferreira et al. 2020).

1 **The Rise of Political Deepfakes**

2 8. However, with the development of artificial intelligence (AI), in particular generative
3 artificial intelligence methods that can easily produce or alter visual materials, a new approach
4 called synthetic manipulation of visual or video materials has arisen. Synthetic manipulation uses
5 AI to produce new visual content or to alter existing visual content (Gertsner et al. 2021).
6 Synthetic manipulation allows for the creation of “... synthesized realistic videos of politicians
7 making statements that they never said, colloquially termed *deepfakes*” (Barari 2024). Thus
8 political deepfakes are synthetically altered digital content, which have been manipulated to
9 deceptively claim or imply that an event or statement occurred, when in fact it did not.

10 9. The problems that political deepfakes pose for democracy may be profound. Because
11 they can be produced using AI, political deepfakes may be produced much more cheaply and
12 maybe be more realistic and difficult to detect than traditionally manipulated images or videos.
13 Because deepfakes can be produced quickly and cheaply, their developers can rapidly produce
14 new and improved versions of the deepfaked content and thus generate increasingly effective and
15 persuasive content. Social media can be used to spread deepfakes quickly, and as social media
16 platforms are moving away from content moderation, it may increasingly be difficult for the
17 public to not fall victim to political deepfakes.

18 10. Obviously, one of the motivations for producing a political deepfake is to mislead the
19 viewer. Thus political deepfakes deliberately seek to spread falsehoods or misleading
20 information. Given that the problem of political deepfakes has only recently emerged, and that
21 they are difficult to detect, the extent of their production, dissemination, and reach is the subject
22 of current research. One effort is the Political Deepfakes Incidents Database (PDID), which
23 started collecting examples of political deepfakes in 2023 and now contains information
24 regarding over 800 political deepfake incidents (Walker et al. 2024). This is likely an
25 underestimate of the number of political deepfakes that have been disseminated, due to the
26 difficulties associated with the identification of political deepfakes. However, the PDID data
27 provide an estimate about the proliferation of political deepfakes, and the incidence data they
28 report show that political deepfakes are being produced and disseminated in recent years.

1 How Political Deepfakes Affect Viewers

2 11. What effects do political deepfakes have on their viewers? There is a wide array of
3 ways that political deepfakes might affect a viewer. One potential effect would be to persuade a
4 viewer to change their opinion, attitude, or preference. For example, a political deepfake could be
5 designed to shift a viewer from supporting one issue position to supporting another issue position;
6 or to persuade a viewer from supporting one candidate to supporting another candidate. Such
7 direct political persuasion is usually quite difficult, as citizens and voters often have relatively
8 strongly held opinions about issues and candidates (Alvarez 1998).

9 12. Political deepfakes can affect viewers in other ways. Importantly, political deepfakes
10 can introduce uncertainty or ambiguity in the minds of citizens and voters — they can sow
11 confusion. Instead of changing the opinion or preference of a viewer, they can lead the viewer to
12 be unsure, and such uncertainty can change subsequent behavior; ambiguity or uncertainty about
13 a political issue can make it difficult to use that issue as part of the voting decision-making
14 process, while uncertainty about candidates could lead to a voter abstaining from either candidate
15 or from casting a ballot at all (Alvarez 1998; Alvarez and Brehm 2002).

16 13. Furthermore, political deepfakes can have other consequences for viewers. They can
17 be used to generate distrust in political institutions and electoral procedures. They can be used to
18 harass and distract the crucial work that election officials and election workers need to perform in
19 the crucial period immediately before and after an election. They can be used to misinform voters
20 about election rules and procedures. In short, political deepfakes can have a multitude of effects
21 on their viewers.

22 14. Because political deepfakes are a new phenomenon, research about their effects on
23 viewers is limited but growing. One study found that while viewers were not persuaded in the
24 truthfulness of statements made in an experimentally deepfake video, the political deepfake
25 increased uncertainty among viewers, which also reduced their trust in news from social media
26 (Vaccari and Chadwick 2020). Dobber et al. (2021) studied political deepfakes intended to
27 discredit political candidates and found that such deepfakes can have detrimental effects on
28 viewers' attitudes about the targeted candidate. Dobber et al. (2021) also found support for their

1 hypothesis that the effects of political deepfakes may be stronger for groups of viewers who are
2 specifically targeted by the deepfake, an issue that we will return to later.

3 15. While not a study about political deepfakes, Wittenberg et al.'s recent study about the
4 persuasiveness of political video and political text are informative (2021). In two experimental
5 studies, they found evidence that information presented in video form was perceived by viewers
6 as more authentic than information presented in textual form, implying that political video
7 content might be more believable to voters than text. However, Wittenberg et al. (2021) find that
8 political video is only modestly more persuasive than political text. In a similar line of research, a
9 forthcoming study by Barari et al. (2024) compares the persuasiveness of false information
10 presented in video, text, and audio formats. They find that presentation of misinformation in the
11 form of a political deepfake is about as deceptive as presentation of the same misinformation in
12 text or audio form. This indicates that political deepfakes are effective in presenting political
13 misinformation.

14 16. To date, the effects of political deepfakes on voter trust and confidence in elections
15 are understudied. However, studies have shown that engagement with election fraud conspiracy
16 theory content on social media is associated with lower turnout in elections (Green et al. 2022).
17 Berlinski et al. (2021) provided experimental evidence showing that exposure to false claims
18 about voting fraud reduces confidence in elections. Other studies have shown that exposure to
19 conspiracy theories about election rigging reduced confidence in elections and support for
20 democratic norms (Albertson and Guiler 2020). All of these studies indicate that political
21 deepfakes, if developed with election fraud conspiracy theory content or false claims about
22 election fraud, could reduce voter trust and confidence in elections and more generally in
23 democratic norms.

24

25 **How Political Deepfakes Affect Election Administration and Trust in Elections**

26 17. In recent election cycles, election officials at the local and state levels have been the
27 subjects of physical and social media harassment and attacks (e.g., Gross et al. 2023). While at
28 this point research has not examined which of these threats and attacks may have involved

1 political deepfakes, it is likely only a matter of time before deepfake attacks are developed against
2 election officials personally or against the work that they undertake during election season. The
3 recent 2024 survey of election officials conducted by Reed College's Elections and Voting
4 Information Center (EVIC) found that over half of election officials surveyed were subjected to
5 personal insults, harassment or threats, especially election officials from larger jurisdictions.
6 Many of the election officials in the EVIC survey reported that they know of other election
7 officials who have left the profession due to threats and harassment. The EVIC survey also found
8 that because of threats and harassment, election officials were changing their workflows by
9 reducing public contact and making other changes in election policies and procedures. Deepfake
10 attacks might enhance these trends in future elections.

11

12 **How New Technologies Make the Development of Political Deepfakes Easier**

13 18. While early AI generated videos, with their distorted physics, nonsensical transitions
14 from frame to frame, and extra fingers were bad enough to be humorously shared on social
15 media, people are decreasingly able to differentiate between real content and high quality fakes.
16 In a recent study, Nightingale and Farid (2022) found that subjects were unable to distinguish real
17 facial images from synthetic facial images. The research also showed that subjects judged the
18 synthetic facial images as more trustworthy (Nightingale and Farid 2022). Advances have come
19 from both more powerful models as well as new approaches to generating deepfakes, such as
20 altering or adapting pre-existing footage, subtly altering it to mislead its audience (Cole, 2024).
21 The same tools and algorithms used to identify content as AI-generated can be used to improve
22 new versions, inducing a cat-and-mouse game known in the computer science literature as the
23 “strategic classification” problem (Hardt et al, 2016). Even as ever more sophisticated efforts to
24 identify AI content are implemented, efforts to label artificial content will also improve the
25 generated content. The result is the ever-increasing quality of deepfake content, with messages
26 that can be individually tailored towards individual users.

27 19. Realistic AI image and video generation models are already ubiquitous. Privately
28 hosted video generation models like OpenAI's SORA (Liu et al, 2024) and Google DeepMind's

1 Veo 2 (Gupta et al, 2024) can produce highly realistic short-form videos in a matter of seconds.
2 Open-source video generation models like GenMo's Mochi (Genmo, 2024) are beginning to
3 match or even surpass the performance of private models. By definition, open source models'
4 weights (the parameters or coefficients in the neural networks that make up the important
5 components of these generative AI models) themselves are freely available for download, and
6 will only become more powerful and wide-spread over time.

7 20. Despite significant industry efforts to implement safeguards within generative AI
8 systems, determined actors can readily circumvent these protective measures through increasingly
9 sophisticated techniques. Safety mechanisms in AI models are frequently compromised through
10 adversarial prompt engineering, where users experiment with carefully crafted inputs to elicit
11 prohibited content (Shayegani et al, 2023). Recent research demonstrates that even consumer-
12 grade models can be “jailbroken” using simple linguistic manipulations that exploit gaps in
13 content filtering systems (Wei et al, 2023). Potentially more concerning are the developments in
14 model “ablation” techniques, where developers deliberately remove or deactivate safety layers
15 from existing models to create unconstrained versions that operate without ethical guardrails (Zou
16 et al, 2023). These modified models proliferate rapidly through underground communities,
17 enabling users with minimal technical expertise to generate deepfake content that evades
18 detection systems. As detection systems improve, adversarial techniques evolve in response,
19 creating an asymmetric advantage for deepfake creators who need only find a single vulnerability
20 to circumvent protective measures.

21 21. Political deepfakes have demonstrated significant cross-spectrum appeal, with
22 examples affecting political figures across ideological divides. In February 2025, a manipulated
23 video suggesting an inappropriate relationship between former President Trump and Elon Musk,
24 depicting Trump kissing Musk's feet, was distributed via hacked screens at the U.S. Department
25 of Housing and Urban Development headquarters, spreading rapidly across social media
26 platforms (ET Online, 2025). Similarly, a deepfake advertisement employing AI voice synthesis
27 to clone Vice President Harris's voice while making statements she never uttered reached millions
28 of users after being shared by Elon Musk on his social media platform X without initially

1 indicating it was parody content (Swenson, 2024). These examples illustrate the velocity at
2 which synthetic media can propagate through digital ecosystems regardless of partisan origin.
3 Research has documented at least 200 politically-motivated deepfakes that achieved significant
4 virality during the 2022 midterm election cycle, with hundreds of millions of monthly views
5 (Corsi et al, 2024). The ubiquity of deepfake content across the political landscape indicates that
6 the technology has transcended partisan boundaries to become a generalized tool for political
7 manipulation that poses systemic challenges to electoral information ecosystems (Chesney and
8 Citron, 2019).

9

10 **Political Deepfakes Are Sticky**

11 22. The persistent cognitive impact of political deepfakes—what we term their
12 “stickiness”—derives from two interrelated technological capabilities. First, contemporary AI
13 systems generate deepfakes with sufficient realness to systematically undermine the
14 discriminatory heuristics humans traditionally employ to differentiate authentic from synthetic
15 content. This technological capability creates a particularly pernicious form of what Ecker et al.
16 (2010) identify as the “continued influence effect,” wherein retracted or corrected information
17 persists in affecting memory and reasoning processes despite subsequent corrections. Their
18 experimental evidence demonstrates that even explicit, detailed warnings about misinformation—
19 while somewhat effective at reducing this persistence—fail to eliminate the cognitive residue of
20 initial exposure. In the context of political deepfakes, this suggests that even when synthetic
21 content is subsequently identified and labeled as manipulated, the initial perceptual processing
22 and cognitive encoding has already established belief structures based on the misinformation
23 being true that are resistant to correction.

24 23. Second, contemporary AI systems facilitate the development of highly persuasive
25 content through multimodal optimization across both message structure and delivery mechanisms.
26 As previously discussed, Simchon et al. (2024) documented how AI-generated content targeted to
27 viewers with specific personality traits demonstrates significantly enhanced persuasive capacity
28 compared to generic messaging. This optimization extends beyond demographic characteristics

1 to include message framing, narrative structure, emotional valence, and modality selection. Matz
2 et al (2024) found that AI-optimized persuasive messaging incorporating domain-specific
3 knowledge about targeted voter populations demonstrated a significant increase in influence on
4 viewers compared to traditionally constructed political messaging, across different domains of
5 persuasion.

6 24. These findings correspond with earlier research from Dobber et al. (2020), which
7 established that microtargeting strategies significantly increase the persuasive effectiveness of
8 political deepfakes. The combination of perceptual realism and persuasive optimization creates
9 what Baker and Détienne (2019) characterize as “cognitive stickiness”—the resistance of
10 synthetically induced beliefs to subsequent correction or modification, even when contradictory
11 evidence is provided. This persistence of belief, documented across multiple experimental
12 paradigms (Barari et al., 2024; Wittenberg et al., 2021), suggests that political deepfakes may
13 generate durable impacts on electoral attitudes and behaviors that transcend conventional models
14 of information processing and belief formation.

15

16 **Political Deepfakes Can Quickly Spread**

17 25. The propagation velocity of political deepfakes constitutes a significant differential
18 vulnerability compared to traditional misinformation. Social media architectures, optimized for
19 engagement maximization, provide particularly hospitable environments for synthetic political
20 content. As Vosoughi et al. (2018) empirically demonstrated in their analysis of rumor cascades,
21 false information propagates “farther, faster, deeper, and more broadly” than truthful content
22 across digital networks, with novelty and emotional activation serving as primary drivers of
23 transmission probability. Political deepfakes, inherently novel and frequently designed to elicit
24 strong emotional responses, exploit these architectural vulnerabilities to achieve viral distribution
25 patterns characterized by exponential early-stage growth and cross-platform migration. Corsi et
26 al. (2024), in their examination of deepfakes on X during 2023, found synthetic tweets accounted
27 for hundreds of millions of views per month.

28

1 26. Targeted political deepfakes represent a particularly concerning propagation modality
2 due to their capacity for unobtrusive dissemination through closed communication channels.
3 Unlike broadcast misinformation, which operates in relatively observable public spaces, targeted
4 deepfakes can propagate through encrypted messaging applications, private social media groups,
5 and personalized content delivery systems that remain largely invisible to researchers, platform
6 governance teams, and electoral oversight bodies. Marwick and Lewis (2024) documented how
7 relatively unsophisticated actors successfully identified and targeted vulnerable voter segments
8 using commercially available tools and openly accessible datasets, as previously discussed. This
9 private propagation modality creates substantial detection and response challenges, as
10 intervention often becomes possible only after significant exposure has occurred.

11 27. The contemporary social media ecosystem's fragmentation further complicates
12 effective monitoring and intervention. Each platform implements distinct content moderation
13 policies, technical architectures, and algorithmic recommendation systems, creating substantial
14 coordination challenges for coherent detection strategies. When coupled with automated
15 distribution through bot networks, which have already played a disproportionate role in spreading
16 articles from low-credibility sources during the 2016 election (Ferrara et al., 2016; Shao et al.,
17 2018), these propagation mechanisms create a particularly challenging information environment
18 for maintaining electoral information integrity.

19

20 **Political Deepfakes and AI-based Microtargeting**

21 28. Political deepfakes developed using AI can also be paired with AI-based
22 microtargeting. Microtargeting involves the development of persuasive content that is targeted to
23 quite specific demographic groups. Microtargeting often involves the use of large datasets, which
24 have detailed information about individuals, including administrative data (for example, from
25 voter registration databases), social media, and other information that can be linked or matched
26 by individual identifiers. Political deepfakes can be developed to persuade or confuse very
27 specific demographic groups, then targeted to individuals in those groups using AI and machine
28 learning models. Microtargeted political deepfakes could be highly effective at persuading or

1 confusing the targeted individuals, and could be very difficult to detect if they are sent directly to
2 specific groups of individuals. For example, a deepfake video could be developed, using a
3 credible local politician, providing incorrect instructions about the deadlines for returning mail
4 ballots, and sent to the social media accounts of registered voters who have only voted by mail in
5 the past.

6 29. Research has shown that microtargeting strategies can increase the persuasive
7 effectiveness of political deepfakes (Dobber et al. 2020). That is, by exposing those who are most
8 open to persuasion to a political deepfake, the perpetrator of the deepfake can increase the
9 efficiency of their campaign. In a very recent study, Simchon et al. (2024) explored a different
10 type of microtargeting strategy. Instead of focusing on demographics, they focused on personality
11 attributes (in their study, the personality trait of openness). Simchon et al. (2024) showed that
12 generative AI and personality-based microtargeting can develop a “manipulation machine”, in
13 which personalized ads generated by AI that are aligned with an individual’s personality are more
14 persuasive than non-personalized AI-generated ads.

15

16 **Can Political Deepfakes Be Identified/Detected?**

17 30. Political deepfakes generated by AI can be highly realistic, and thus difficult for both
18 human observers and automated systems to detect as misleading. The sophistication of
19 contemporary deepfake technology has advanced substantially beyond early implementations that
20 contained obvious artifacts such as unnatural blinking patterns or inconsistent facial features
21 (Korshunov and Marcel, 2019). Modern deepfake generators employ increasingly sophisticated
22 techniques for face synthesis, attribute manipulation, and audio reproduction that create highly
23 convincing counterfeit media (Nguyen et al., 2022). These techniques can generate photo-
24 realistic face images, edit facial attributes to create false identities for social media dissemination,
25 and synthesize convincing voice replications through either text-to-speech synthesis or voice
26 conversion methods (Verdoliva, 2020). The proliferation of accessible manipulation tools further
27 complicates authentication and integrity verification of potentially manipulated political content

1 as these applications allow for secondary modifications that can mask telltale signs of synthesis
2 (Li et al., 2020).

3 31. Detection of political deepfakes constitutes an active and rapidly evolving research
4 domain with multiple methodological approaches under development. Traditional forensic
5 techniques initially employed for detecting conventional image forgeries have demonstrated
6 limited effectiveness when applied to AI-generated content (Agarwal et al., 2019). Consequently,
7 researchers have developed two primary categories of detection methods. First, techniques based
8 on handcrafted features extract specific artifacts or statistical patterns from suspected deepfakes
9 (see e.g. McCloskey et al. (2019) or Guarnera et al. (2020)). The second category employs deep
10 learning architectures to automatically identify deepfake signatures (see e.g. Nataraj et al. (2019),
11 Yu et al. (2019), or Marra et al. (2019)). Despite these advances, Guera and Delp (2018)
12 demonstrated that most detection methods remain vulnerable to adversarial modifications and
13 post-processing operations including noise addition, compression, and blurring.

14 32. The same tools and algorithms used to identify content as AI-generated can be used to
15 improve new generations of deepfakes, inducing what computer scientists term the “strategic
16 classification” problem (Hardt et al., 2016). This creates a perpetual technological arms race
17 between detection and generation capabilities. As Rossler et al. (2019) documented, detection
18 methods achieving 95% accuracy on one generation of deepfakes frequently drop below 65%
19 accuracy when confronted with subsequent generations that have been optimized to evade
20 detection. This dynamic fundamentally advantages deepfake creators, who need only find a
21 single vulnerability in detection systems to successfully distribute misleading content, while
22 detection systems must comprehensively address all potential manipulation strategies. The
23 asymmetric nature of this contest suggests that even as detection techniques improve, the
24 generation of convincing deepfakes likely remains technically feasible for motivated actors
25 (Dolhansky et al., 2020).

26 33. The scale and diversity of contemporary social media platforms further complicate
27 effective detection and monitoring of political deepfakes. The decentralized nature of platforms
28 including TikTok, X, Truth Social, Instagram, and numerous others creates significant

1 fragmentation in monitoring capabilities (Paris and Donovan, 2019). Each platform implements
2 distinct content moderation policies, employs different technical architectures, and attracts
3 demographically diverse user bases—creating substantial coordination challenges for coherent
4 detection strategies.

5 34. In short, while numerous technical approaches for deepfake detection show promise
6 in controlled experimental settings, the dynamic nature of deepfake generation techniques, the
7 strategic adaptation of generators to evade detection, and the fragmented media distribution
8 landscape collectively present substantial challenges for comprehensive identification of political
9 deepfakes. These challenges suggest that technical detection alone will likely prove insufficient,
10 necessitating complementary approaches including digital media literacy initiatives, institutional
11 verification systems, and regulatory frameworks to mitigate the potential democratic harms of
12 synthetic political content.

13

14 **Political Deepfakes Are a National Security Issue**

15 35. There is growing concern that foreign adversaries (like Russia, Iran and China) will
16 use sophisticated synthetic manipulation approaches to influence U.S. elections and election
17 infrastructure. Microsoft recently analyzed two such AI-enabled political influence operations in
18 2024, both involving the use of generative AI to develop compelling visual content that sought to
19 influence American public opinion and political events (Microsoft 2024). Regarding one of these
20 Chinese state-affiliated influence operations, Microsoft (2024) reported:

21 “Taizi Flood is the most prolific threat actor in this arena, using third-party AI technology,
22 including technology that generates virtual news anchors, for its online campaigns. With
23 influence operations spanning over 175 websites and 58 languages, Taizi Flood has continuously
24 mounted reactive messaging campaigns around high-profile geopolitical events, with a focus on
25 portraying the United States in an unfavorable light and furthering Beijing’s interests in the Asia-
26 Pacific region. During the Maui, Hawaii wildfires in August 2023, the actor used AI-generated
27 images of burning coastal roads and residences to augment the conspiratorial narratives about
28 U.S. Government complicity it spread across social media platforms.”

1 36. Microsoft (2024) also discussed at length a case in 2024 where a Russian state-
2 affiliated influence group (“Storm-1679”) developed a fake documentary, including AI-generated
3 audio which used the voice of actor Tom Cruise, supposedly criticizing the leadership and
4 operations of the International Olympic Committee. This video, and a “sequel”, were part of
5 Russian efforts to discredit the 2024 Olympics in Paris (Microsoft 2024). While Microsoft (2024)
6 has concluded that so far these AI-generated influence campaigns have had limited reach, they
7 warn that “if integrated into otherwise creative and multifaceted influence operations, AI may
8 prove to offer a significant capability in reaching and engaging audiences in the future.”

9 37. Similarly, researchers have discussed how political deepfakes may increasingly be
10 used by nonstate actors in their attempts to achieve their political goals. One example is how
11 terrorist groups in India have used political deepfakes for recruitment and to provoke violence
12 (Kreps 2021). Deepfakes might also be developed in target locations to influence public opinion
13 about military activities (Kreps 2021).

14

15 **Can Political Deepfakes Be Mitigated?**

16 38. As a type of misinformation, political deepfakes, once disseminated, can be difficult
17 to mitigate. There are two ways that political misinformation can be mitigated: pre-bunking or
18 de-bunking, with current research noting that each can be effective (van der Linden 2022, Bruns
19 et al. 2024, Roozenbeek and van der Linden 2024). Pre-bunking involves exposing individuals to
20 misinformation and warning them beforehand that it is misinformation, in an attempt to
21 strengthen their cognitive tools to be more skeptical of future misinformation. De-bunking
22 involves trying to persuade the individual that the misinformation is incorrect and that they
23 should not believe it.

24 39. As mitigation strategies, pre-bunking and de-bunking have different strengths and
25 weaknesses. Pre-bunking requires the identification of the deepfake message prior to
26 dissemination, and a population-level effort to inoculate many potential viewers to the message so
27 that they will be more likely to treat it skeptically when they encounter the actual deepfake (van
28 der Linden 2023). De-bunking requires targeting all or most viewers of a political deepfake and

1 providing them effective counter-messaging. Unfortunately, research has found that once
2 misinformation takes hold, the misinformation can continue to mislead the recipient even when
3 de-bunked (Lewandowsky et al. 2012). While both pre-bunking and de-bunking are promising
4 methods for countering misinformation and political deepfakes, it is not clear at present how these
5 methods could be deployed at a very large scale (say the state of California).

6 40. Not surprisingly, with strengthened media literacy skills and greater political
7 sophistication, people can be more likely to identify political deepfakes and less likely to believe
8 that they are accurate (Appel and Prietzel 2022). However, developing heightened media literacy
9 skills and more political sophistication as a means to train the electorate to better detect deepfakes
10 would require a large investment of resources.

11 41. Research has also focused attention on the labeling of misinformation. Substantial
12 research indicates that labeling misinformation is generally effective at limiting its credibility and
13 spread (Martel and Rand 2023). More specifically, studies have documented that warning labels
14 can diminish the credibility and believability of online misinformation (Clayton et al. 2020, Koch
15 et al. 2023, Pennycock et al. 2020, and Parker and Wood 2022). Misinformation warnings can
16 also mitigate the amplification and spread of misinformation (Koch et al. 2023, Epstein et al.
17 2022, Mena 2020, Li et al. 2023).

18 42. In recent research, Josephs et al. (2024) note that deepfake detection in the real world
19 is a difficult problem. Much of the research on misinformation and deepfake detection has
20 occurred in experimental settings and in environments that might make deepfake detection easier
21 than in the real world — thus Josephs et al. (2024) note that researchers may have overestimated
22 the ability of viewers to easily detect deepfakes in real world settings. For example, in the real
23 world deepfakes are embedded in other material. Viewers may be distracted and thus may not
24 pick up on subtle cues that a video they were watching is unrealistic. Sometimes viewers might
25 be watching a deepfake using an internet connection or technology that blurs the video in ways
26 that might obscure cues that could reveal the manipulations of the video and images.

27 43. In order to make it easier for viewers to detect the often subtle distortions or oddities
28 that might help identify a deepfake, Josephs et al. (2024) studied the use of an AI system which

1 identifies existing distortions in a deepfake video, and which then amplifies those distortions.
2 They found that viewers are more likely to identify the AI-distorted video as a deepfake, thus
3 opening the door to a new way in which deepfake videos might be manipulated to make their
4 deepfake nature more obvious to more viewers.

5 44. Researchers have also begun to study other methods of warning about the presence of
6 deepfake videos. Lewis et al. (2023) showed a series of videos to viewers, and those who were
7 exposed to a relatively neutral deepfake video were generally unable to determine that they saw a
8 deepfaked video. But among viewers who were warned that at least one of the videos they were
9 seeing was a deepfake, about a fifth of viewers correctly identified the deepfaked video (Lewis et
10 al. 2023). Their evidence indicates that the warning might generally increase skepticism among
11 viewers about the veracity of all the videos they watched as part of their study (Lewis et al. 2023).

12 45. Finally, in recent years a robust research literature has arisen developing automated
13 and AI-based methods for deepfake detection, much of this driven by the availability of the
14 Deepfake Detection Challenge Dataset (Dolhansky et al., 2022). An obvious method for
15 detection of political deepfakes and mitigating their effects would be the use of automated
16 methods. Automated methods could identify and label political deepfakes as such, or use
17 methods like those developed by Lewis et al. (2023) to distort political deepfakes to make them
18 more readily identifiable by viewers. However, work by Groh et al. (2022) casts considerable
19 doubt on a fully-automated approach, as they found that even the best automated computer vision
20 approaches for deepfake detection performed about as well as human observers in the difficult
21 task of deepfake detection.

22

23 **Conclusion**

24 46. Visual information and facial images provide important cues and heuristics for
25 humans when they are asked to make decisions in situations where information is uncertain or
26 limited. Political campaigns and candidates rely upon the power of visual information in their
27 communications, as visual information has the power to persuade.

28

1 47. Given the power of visual information, such information also has the power to
2 mislead and deceive. Compelling visual information, in particular in the context of videos and
3 advertisements, can be used to spread rumors, conspiracy theories, and false information.

4 48. The rapid development of artificial intelligence, in particular generative artificial
5 intelligence, has made it very easy for nearly anyone to produce misleading and false content, or
6 to take existing visual or video content and alter it with the intent to mislead and deceive. The
7 “synthetic manipulation” of political content creates “political deepfakes”, that can now be
8 developed in a matter of minutes at very low cost. With a wide array of social media platforms in
9 existence, many of which have little or no content moderation, political deepfakes can be spread
10 on social media and go viral rapidly, before they can be detected and mitigated.

11 49. The ease with which political deepfakes can be developed means that they can be
12 mass produced. The mass production of political deepfakes implies that they can be tested for
13 efficacy and optimized for maximum impact on the viewers they seek to mislead or deceive. This
14 also means that many versions of a political deepfake can be produced for dissemination, making
15 them difficult to detect at scale — with many versions of a political deepfake in circulation, some
16 might escape human or machine detection. This also means that very similar (but slightly
17 different in targeted ways) versions of deepfake political content can be disseminated to different
18 targeted audiences. Artificial intelligence systems can also be used to assemble and analyze
19 datasets to develop microtargeting strategies for political deepfakes, and microtargeted political
20 deepfakes could be hard to detect and prevent while also very effective at persuasion.

21 50. While political deepfakes may be used to persuade or change opinions and behavior,
22 they can also be used for other purposes. Research has shown that they can be used to generate
23 uncertainty or ambiguity in the minds of viewers, thus producing confusion. Political deepfakes
24 can also target political organizations and institutions, in particular election rules, procedures, and
25 officials, casting doubt on their integrity and reducing trust in elections and democratic
26 institutions. All of these effects of political deepfakes may influence political behavior, ranging
27 from making voters less likely to turn out in elections to affecting who they may vote for in an
28 election.

1 51. Given these uses of political deepfakes, there is concern among researchers and
2 policymakers about the production of synthetically manipulated materials by state and non-state
3 actors for the purpose of affecting American politics and elections. Research from organizations
4 like Microsoft has shown that Chinese and Russian actors have been producing political
5 deepfakes and have tried to disseminate political deepfakes during U.S. elections. As state and
6 non-state actors with interests in affecting American elections experiment with deepfake
7 technology, they may develop political deepfakes in future elections that might be very difficult
8 to detect and deter.

9 52. Political deepfakes are difficult to detect, both by humans and by artificial
10 intelligence. A large research literature in computer science has arisen in recent years, trying to
11 develop computer vision methods to detect deepfakes. At present, these attempts to develop AI-
12 based deepfake detectors have not kept pace with the development of systems to produce
13 deepfakes, and so the technology for automated deepfake detection has not proven to be highly
14 effective in that task.

15 53. Political deepfakes are sticky, as they have persistent cognitive impact. They are
16 sticky because the technology of synthetic manipulation produces highly realistic content. The
17 manipulation of existing content into a political deepfake, or the development of new content as a
18 political deepfake, is highly realistic and this very believable. Secondly, political deepfakes are
19 sticky because the technology can optimize both the message content and delivery. Because
20 political deepfakes can be made inexpensively and quickly, their producers can generate one, test
21 it for effectiveness, and then generate another that improves upon the first. This process can be
22 repeated over and over to develop content that is highly effective. Also, AI can quickly sift
23 through large datasets to find, analyze, and discover optimal target audiences for political
24 deepfakes, through microtargeting, delivering persuasive content to the best target audience.

25 54. At present, research is focusing on pre-bunking methods for developing cognitive
26 skills that people can use to be more skeptical when they are faced with misinformation, and on
27 de-bunking methods for stopping the spread and effects of misinformation. While recent research
28 indicates that both pre-bunking and de-bunking are effective, there are limitations in their use in

1 real-time and at the scale necessary for effectiveness. At present, while the research about these
2 tactics is promising, it is unclear if pre-bunking or de-bunking a political deepfake in real-time at
3 scale (say in the context of a gubernatorial election in California) is possible.

4 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
5 foregoing is true and correct.

6 Executed this 7th day of March, 2025, in Pasadena, California.

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



R. Michael Alvarez
Declarant

1 **References**

2 Agarwal, Shruti, et al. "Protecting world leaders against deep fakes." In Proceedings of the IEEE
 3 Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshops (pp. 38–45), 2019,
 IEEE. <https://perma.cc/2bcs-m8j3>

4 Albertson, Bethany and Kimberly Guiler. "Conspiracy theories, election rigging, and support for
 5 democratic norms." *Research & Politics*, 7(3), 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168020959859>

6 Alvarez, R. Michael. *Information & Elections*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan press,
 revised edition, 1998.

7 Alvarez, R. Michael and John Brehm. *Hard Choices, Easy Answers: Values, Information, and
 8 American Public Opinion*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.

9 Ansolabehere, Stephen, et al. "Does Attack Advertising Demobilize the Electorate?" *American
 Political Science Review*, vol 88. 1994, pp. 829-838.

10 Appel, Markus and Fabian Prietzel. "The Detection of Political Deepfakes." *Journal of
 11 Computer-Mediated Communications*, vol. 27, no. 4, 2022,
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmac008>.

12 Artimo, Oriol, Valeria d'Andrea, Riccardo Gallotti, Pier Luigi Sacco, and Manlio De Domenico.
 13 "Effectiveness of dismantling strategies on moderated vs. unmoderated online social platforms."
Scientific reports 10, no. 1 (2020): 14392.

14 Baker, Michael J., and Françoise Détienne. "Knowing, Remembering, and Relating to Others
 15 Online: A Commentary." *Topics in cognitive science* 11.4 (2019): 825-830.

16 Banducci, Susan A., et al. "Ballot Photographs as Cues in Low-Information Elections. *Political
 Psychology*, vol. 29, no. 6, 2008, pp. 903-917.

17 Barari, Soubhik, et al. "Political Deepfakes are as Credible as Other Fake Media (and
 18 Sometimes) Real Media." *Journal of Politics*, 2024, forthcoming, <https://doi.org/10.1086/732990>.

19 Berlinski, Nicolas, et al. The Effects of Unsubstantiated Claims of Voter Fraud on Confidence in
 Elections. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*. 2023;10(1):34-49. doi:10.1017/XPS.2021.18

20 Bruns, Hendrik, et al. Investigating the role of source and source trust in prebunks and debunks of
 21 misinformation in online experiments across four EU countries. *Scientific Reports* 14, 20723
 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-71599-6>

22 Chesney, R., & Citron, D. (2019). Deepfakes and the new disinformation war: The coming age of
 23 post-truth geopolitics. *Foreign Aff.*, 98, 147.

24 Chesney, Bobby, and Danielle Citron. "Deep fakes: A looming challenge for privacy, democracy,
 and national security." *Calif. L. Rev.* 107 (2019): 1753.

25 Clayton, Katherine, et al. "Real Solutions for Fake News? Measuring the
 26 Effectiveness of General Warnings and Fact-Check Tags in Reducing Belief in
 False Stories on Social Media." *Political Behavior*, 42, 1073–1095 (2020).

27 Cole, WR. "Beyond Deepfakes: Synthetic Moving Images and the Future of History". *Journal of
 28 Information Warfare* (2024) 23.1: 95-110.

1 Corsi, G., Marino, B., & Wong, W. (2024). The spread of synthetic media on x. *Harvard*
2 *Kennedy School (HKS) Misinformation Review*.

3 Dobber, Tom., et al. Do (Microtargeted) Deepfakes Have Real Effects on Political Attitudes? The
4 International Journal of Press/Politics, vol. 26, no. 1, 2021, 69-91.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161220944364>

5 Dolhansky, Brian, et al.. "The deepfake detection challenge (DFDC) dataset." *arXiv preprint*
6 *arXiv:2006.07397* (2020).

7 Ecker, Ullrich KH, Stephan Lewandowsky, and David TW Tang. "Explicit warnings reduce but
8 do not eliminate the continued influence of misinformation." *Memory & cognition* 38 (2010):
9 1087-1100.

10 Ecker, Ullrich KH, Stephan Lewandowsky, John Cook, Philipp Schmid, Lisa K. Fazio, Nadia
11 Brashier, Panayiota Kendeou, Emily K. Vraga, and Michelle A. Amazeen. "The psychological
12 drivers of misinformation belief and its resistance to correction." *Nature Reviews Psychology* 1,
13 no. 1 (2022): 13-29.

14 Epstein, Ziv, et al. "Do Explanations Increase the Effectiveness of AI-Crowd Generated Fake
15 News Warnings?" *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*
16 16, 183–193 (2022).

17 Ferrara, Emilio. "What types of COVID-19 conspiracies are populated by Twitter bots?." *arXiv*
18 *preprint arXiv:2004.09531* (2020).

19 Ferrara, Emilio, Onur Varol, Clayton Davis, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. "The
20 rise of social bots." *Communications of the ACM* 59, no. 7 (2016): 96-104.

21 Ferreira, William D. et al. "A Review of Digital Image Forensics." *Computers & Electrical
22 Engineering*, vol. 85, July 2020, 106685, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compeleceng.2020.106685>.

23 Genmo Team (2024). "Mocho 1". <https://github.com/genmoai/models>

24 Gerstner, Candice, et al. "Deepfakes: Is a Picture Worth a Thousand Lies? The Next Wave, vol.
25 23, no. 1, 2021, pp. 41-52.

26 Green, Jon, et al. "Online Engagement with 2020 Election Misinformation and Turnout in the
27 2021 Georgia Runoff Election." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, vol. 119, no.
28 34 (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2115900119>.

29 Groh, Matthew, et al. "Deepfake detection by human crowds, machines, and machine-informed
30 crowds." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, vol. 119, no. 1, 2022, e2110013119,
31 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2110013119>.

32 Gronke, Paul, et al. Today's Election Administration Landscape: Findings from the 2024
33 Elections & Voting Information Center Local Election Official Survey. *Elections & Voting
34 Information Center (EVIC)*, Reed College, February 2025.

35 Gross, Joelle, et al. "What Happens When the President Calls You an Enemy of the People?
36 Election Officials and Public Sentiment. *Election Law Journal*, vol 22, no 2, 2023.

37 Guarnera, Luca, Oliver Giudice, and Sebastiano Battiato. "Deepfake detection by analyzing
38 convolutional traces." In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and*

1 *pattern recognition workshops*, pp. 666-667. 2020.

2 Güera, David and Edward J. Delp. "Deepfake video detection using recurrent neural networks." In 2018 15th IEEE International Conference on Advanced Video and Signal Based Surveillance (AVSS) (pp. 1–6), 2018. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/avss.2018.8639163>

3 Gupta, Agrim et al. (2024). "Veo 2". <https://deepmind.google/technologies/veo/veo-2/>

4 Hackenburg, Kobi, and Helen Margetts. "Evaluating the persuasive influence of political microtargeting with large language models." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 121.24 (2024): e2403116121.

5 Hardt, Motitz, Nimrod Megiddo, Christos Papadimitriou, and Mary Wootters. "Strategic Classification". *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM conference on innovations in theoretical computer science*. 2016.

6 Josephs, Emilie, et al. "Effects of Browsing Conditions and Visual Alert Design on Human Susceptibility to Deepfakes." *Journal of Online Trust and Safety*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.54501/jots.v2i2.144>

7 Koch, Timo K., et al. "Effects of fact-checking warning labels and social endorsement cues on climate change fake news credibility and engagement on social media." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 53, 495–507 (2023)

8 Korshunov, Pavel and Sebastien Marce. "Vulnerability assessment and detection of deepfake videos." In The 12th IAPR International Conference on Biometrics (ICB) (pp. 1–6). IEEE, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1109/icb45273.2019.8987375>

9 Kreps, Sarah. "Democratizing Harm: Artificial Intelligence in the Hands of Nonstate Actors." Brookings Institution, 2021, https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/FP_20211122_ai_nonstate_actors_kreps.pdf.

10 Lewandowsky, Stephan, et al. "Misinformation and its correction: Continued influence and successful debiasing." *Psychological science in the public interest* 13.3 (2012): 106-131.

11 Lewis, Andrew, et al. "Deepfake detection with and without content warnings." *Royal Society Open Science*, vol. 10, 231214, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.231214>.

12 Li, Zhufong, et al. "The Effect of Misinformation Intervention: Evidence from Trump's Tweets and the 2020 Election." In: Ceolin, D., Caselli, T., Tulin, M. (eds) *Disinformation in Open Online Media. MISDOOM 2023. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 14397 2023. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-47896-3_7

13 Li, Yuezun, Xin Yang, Pu Sun, Honggang Qi, and Siwei Lyu. "Celeb-df: A large-scale challenging dataset for deepfake forensics." In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 3207-3216. 2020.

14 Liu, Yixin, et al. "Sora: A review on background, technology, limitations, and opportunities of large vision models." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17177* (2024).

15 Marra, Francesco, Diego Gragnaniello, Davide Cozzolino, and Luisa Verdoliva. "Detection of gan-generated fake images over social networks." In *2018 IEEE conference on multimedia information processing and retrieval (MIPR)*, pp. 384-389. IEEE, 2018.

16 Martel, Cameron and David G. Rand. Misinformation Warning Labels are Widely Effective: A

1 Review of Warning Effects and Their Moderation Features. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, vol.
2 54, (2023): 101710.

3 Mattes, Kyle, et al. "Predicting Election Outcomes from Positive and Negative Trait Assessments
4 of Candidate Images." *Political Psychology*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2010, pp. 41–58.

5 Matz, Sandra C., Jacob D. Teeny, Sumer S. Vaid, Heinrich Peters, Gabriella M. Harari, and
6 Moran Cerf. "The potential of generative AI for personalized persuasion at scale." *Scientific
7 Reports* 14, no. 1 (2024): 4692.

8 McCloskey, Scott, and Michael Albright. "Detecting GAN-generated imagery using saturation
9 cues." In *2019 IEEE international conference on image processing (ICIP)*, pp. 4584–4588. IEEE,
10 2019.

11 Mena, Paul. "Cleaning Up Social Media: The Effect of Warning Labels on Likelihood of Sharing
12 False News on Facebook." *Policy & Internet* 12, 165–183 (2020).

13 Microsoft. "Microsoft Digital Defense Report 2024", 2024. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/security/security-insider/intelligence-reports/microsoft-digital-defense-report-2024>.

14 Nataraj, Lakshmanan, Tajuddin Manhar Mohammed, Shivkumar Chandrasekaran, Arjuna
15 Flenner, Jawadul H. Bappy, Amit K. Roy-Chowdhury, and B. S. Manjunath. "Detecting GAN
16 generated fake images using co-occurrence matrices." *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.06836* (2019).

17 Nightingale, Sophie J. and Hany Farid, AI-synthesized faces are indistinguishable from real faces
18 and more trustworthy, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* vol. 119, no. 8,
19 e2120481119, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2120481119> (2022).

20

21 Noggle, Gary, and Lynda Lee Kaid. "The Effects of Visual Images in Political Ads: Experimental
22 Testing of Distortions and Visual Literacy." *Social Science Quarterly*, vol. 81, no. 4, 2000, pp.
23 913–27.

24 Nguyen, Thanh Thi, Quoc Viet Hung Nguyen, Dung Tien Nguyen, Duc Thanh Nguyen, Thien
25 Huynh-The, Saeid Nahavandi, Thanh Tam Nguyen, Quoc-Viet Pham, and Cuong M. Nguyen.
26 "Deep learning for deepfakes creation and detection: A survey." *Computer Vision and Image
Understanding* 223 (2022): 103525. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cviu.2022.103525>

27 Paris, Britt, and Joan Donovan. "Deepfakes and cheap fakes." *United States of America: Data &
28 Society* 1 (2019).

29 Pennycook, Gorton, et al. "The Implied Truth Effect: Attaching Warnings to a Subset of Fake
30 News Headlines Increases Perceived Accuracy of Headlines Without Warnings. *Management
Science* 66, 4944–4957, (2020).

31 Porter, Ethan and Thomas J. Wood. "Political Misinformation and Factual Corrections on the
32 Facebook News Feed: Experimental Evidence." *The Journal of Politics* 84, 1812–
33 1817 (2022).

34 Rogiers, Alexander, et al. "Persuasion with Large Language Models: a Survey." *arXiv preprint
arXiv:2411.06837* (2024).

35 Roozenbeek, Jon and Sander van der Linden. *The Psychology of Misinformation*. Cambridge
36 University Press, 2024.

1 Rosenberg, Shawn W., et al. "The Image and the Vote: The Effect of Candidate Presentation on
2 Voter Preference." *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 30, no. 1, 1986, pp. 108–27.

3 Rossler, Andreas, Davide Cozzolino, Luisa Verdoliva, Christian Riess, Justus Thies, and Matthias
4 Nießner. "Faceforensics++: Learning to detect manipulated facial images." In *Proceedings of the
IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pp. 1-11. 2019.

5 Shao, Chengcheng, Giovanni Luca Ciampaglia, Onur Varol, Kai-Cheng Yang, Alessandro
6 Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. "The spread of low-credibility content by social bots." *Nature
communications* 9, no. 1 (2018): 4787.

7 Simchon, Almog, et al. "The Persuasive Effects of Political Microtargeting in the Age of
8 Generative Artificial Intelligence." *PNAS Nexus*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2024,
9 <https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae035>.

10 Shayegani, E., Mamun, M. A. A., Fu, Y., Zaree, P., Dong, Y., & Abu-Ghazaleh, N. (2023).
11 Survey of vulnerabilities in large language models revealed by adversarial attacks. *arXiv preprint
arXiv:2310.10844*.

12 Spezio, Michael L., et al. "Thin-Slice Decisions Do Not Need Faces to be Predictive of Election
13 Outcomes." *Political Psychology*, vol. 33, no. 3, 2012, pp. 331-341.

14 Todorov, Alexander, et al. "Inferences of Competence from Faces Predict Election Outcomes." *Science* 308, 1623-1626, 2005. DOI:10.1126/science.1110589.

15 Vaccari, Christian Andrew Chadwick. "Deepfakes and Disinformation: Exploring the Impact of
16 Synthetic Political Video on Deception, Uncertainty, and Trust in News." *Social Media +
Society*, 6(1), 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120903408>

17 van der Linden, Sander. Misinformation: susceptibility, spread, and interventions to immunize the
18 public. *Nat Med* 28, 460–467 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-01713-6>.

19 van der linden, Sander. *Foolproof: Why Misinformation Infects Our Minds and How to Build
Immunity*. Basic Books, 2023.

20 Verdoliva, Luisa. "Media forensics and deepfakes: an overview." *IEEE journal of selected topics
in signal processing* 14, no. 5 (2020): 910-932.

21 Vosoughi, Soroush, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. "The spread of true and false news online." *Science* 359, no. 6380 (2018): 1146-1151.

22 Walker, Christina. P., et al. "Merging AI Incidents Research With Political Misinformation
23 Research: Introducing the Political Deepfakes Incidents Database". *Proceedings of the AAAI
Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 21, Mar. 2024, pp. 23053-8,
24 doi:10.1609/aaai.v38i21.30349.

25 Wei, Jason, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V. Le, and
Denny Zhou. "Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models." *Advances
in neural information processing systems* 35 (2022): 24824-24837.

26 Wittenberg, Chloe, et al. "The (minimal) persuasive advantage of political video over text." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 118 (47) e2114388118, 2021,
27 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2114388118>.

28

1 Yu, Ning, Larry S. Davis, and Mario Fritz. "Attributing fake images to gans: Learning and
2 analyzing gan fingerprints." In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on*
computer vision, pp. 7556-7566. 2019.

3 Zou, Andy, Zifan Wang, Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, J. Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson.
4 "Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models." *arXiv preprint*
arXiv:2307.15043 (2023).

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

EXHIBIT 1

CURRICULUM VITAE

RAMON MICHAEL ALVAREZ

DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
MAIL CODE 228-77
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
PASADENA, CA 91125
626-395-4422
E-MAIL: RMA@CALTECH.EDU
RMICHAELALVAREZ.COM

[ACADEMIC BACKGROUND]

- Flintridge Foundation Professor of Political and Computational Social Science with tenure, California Institute of Technology, April 2024 to present.
- Founding Co-Director, The Ronald and Maxine Linde Center for Science, Society, and Policy (LCSSP), January 2023 to present.
- Professor of Political and Computational Social Science with tenure, California Institute of Technology, January 2020 to March 2024.
- Professor of Political Science with tenure, California Institute of Technology, February 2002 to 2019.
- Associate Professor of Political Science with tenure, California Institute of Technology, June 1997 to February 2002.
- Associate Professor of Political Science, California Institute of Technology, April 1995 to June 1997.
- Assistant Professor of Political Science, California Institute of Technology, December 1992 to April 1995.
- Robert S. Rankin Instructor of American Politics, Duke University, 1991-1992.
- Duke University, Ph.D., December 1992 (Political Science). M.A., with distinction on Ph.D. Preliminary Examination, May 1990, (Political Science).
- Carleton College, B.A., *magna cum laude*, 1986 (Political Science).

[GRANTS AND FELLOWSHIPS]

- John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation, 2024-2025. Project title: “Preventing Election Misinformation and Election Crises in Southern California” (\$302,280), PI.
- Activision Publishing Inc., 2022-2025, Project title: “AI For Detecting and Mitigating Toxic Behavior” (\$496,531), co-PI.
- Caltech Merkin Institute Translational Research Grant, 2022-2024, Project title: “Using Computational Modeling and a Comprehensive Task Battery to Identify the Cognitive Attributes Underpinning Susceptibility to Vaccine Skepticism” (\$240,000), Investigator.
- Caltech Resnick Sustainability Institute, 2021-2022, Project title: “The Caltech Critical Zone Initiative” (\$130,590), renewable 2022-2024, co-PI.
- National Science Foundation, 2021, Project title: “RAPID: Detecting and Deterring Harmful Online Speech Directed At American Election Officials”, (\$76,627), Principal Investigator. Award Number 2126095.
- National Science Foundation, 2021, Project title: “Election Science: Convergence Accelerator Workshop Proposal”, (\$95,447.00), Co-Principal Investigator. Award Number 2122039.
- State of California, Secretary of State, 2020, Project title: “VCA Los Angeles County Research” (\$66,000).
- Google Cloud COVID-19 Research Credits Program, (\$15,000 in GCP credits; continuation with \$9,000 in GCP credits), “Managing Elections During the COVID-19 Pandemic.”
- Google Cloud COVID-19 Research Credits Program (\$7,500 in GCP credits; continuation with \$16,350 in GCP credits), “Studying COVID-19 Pandemic Misinformation and Protest Using Social Media Data”.

- State of Oregon. 2019. “State of Oregon Election Performance Audit Project” (\$50,000), collaborative with Reed College.
- National Science Foundation. 2019. Project title: “Multidisciplinary Conference on Election Auditing” (\$43,615), Co-Principal Investigator. Award Number 1757307.
- John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation. 2019-2021. Project title: “Monitoring the Integrity of Elections in Southern California: The 2020 Elections” (\$375,330).
- John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation. 2018. Project title: “Assuring Election Integrity: A Comprehensive Ecological Framework for Evaluating Election Administration in Southern California” (\$229,000).
- Ronald and Maxine Linde Institute of Economic and Management Sciences Research Grant, 2017. Project title: “Improving the Measurement of Individual Consumer Data”, (\$12,000).
- John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation Faculty Fellowship, 2017. Project title: “The consequences of primary process reform in California,” (\$12,000).
- Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2016-2017. Project title: Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project: The Past, Present, and Future of Election Administration in the United States” (\$75,000).
- Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2012. Project title: “Voting: What Has Changed, What Hasn’t, and What Needs Improvement”, May 2012-December 2012 (\$50,000).
- California Forward, 2012. Project title: “Primary Process Reform and Political Representation in California”, March 2012-December 2013, (\$50,000).
- James Irvine Foundation, 2012. Project title: “Primary Process Reform and Political Representation in California”, March 2012-December 2013, (\$200,000).
- James Irvine Foundation, 2010. Project title: “Voting Systems Assessment Project”, February 2010-December 2010, (\$150,000).
- John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation, 2010. Project title: “The Rise of the Decline to States”, January 1, 2010-December 31, 2010, (\$159,039).
- John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Faculty Fellowship, 2009. Project title: “Convenience Voting in California”, April 2009-November 2009, (\$12,000).
- Pew Charitable Trusts, “Make Voting Work: Evaluation of an Effort to Modernize the Voter Registration System in Ohio, Kentucky and Indiana,” 2007-2009 (\$221,200)
- Pew Charitable Trusts, “Make Voting Work: “Lessons for All in Determining Voter Intent and Election Integrity: A 2006 Post Election Audit Study of New Mexico’s Optical Scan Ballots in Bernalillo County, New Mexico,” 2007-2008 (\$35,500, Subcontract, University of New Mexico)
- Pew Charitable Trusts, “Make Voting Work: “Verified Voter Paper Audit Trail Study,” 2007-2008 (\$19,525, Subcontract, University of Utah)
- Senior Fellow, USC Annenberg Center for Communication, 2006-2007
- Caltech CBIC Discovery Grant, “Neuroimaging of Political Judgment,” 2006 (\$4,350)
- John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, “Creating Accessible and Secure Voting Systems,” 2006-2009, Co-principal Investigator (\$375,000).
- Carnegie Corporation of New York, “Producing A Better American Electoral Process: Process, Technology, and Outreach”, 2005-2007, Co-principal Investigator, (\$300,000).
- Carnegie Corporation of New York, “Electronic Elections”, 2005-2006, Co-principal Investigator, (\$50,000).
- IBM Center for The Business of Government, “Database Integration for Election Administration”, 2004-2005, Co-principal Investigator, (\$15,000).
- John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, “Internet and Electronic Voting”, 2003 – 2006, Co-principal Investigator, (\$650,000).
- U.S. Department of Defense, “Evaluation of the Secure Electronic Registration and Voting (SERVE) Project”, November 2002 – December 2005, Principal Investigator, (\$1,700,000).
- Carnegie Corporation, “Internet Voting”, 2003 – 2005, Co-principal Investigator, (\$273,000).
- U.S. Department of Defense, “Evaluation of the Secure Electronic Registration and Voting (SERVE) Project”, DASW01-02-C-0027, (\$236,140), Principal Investigator.
- John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation Faculty Fellowship, 2002. Project title: “California’s Voting Systems”, May 2002 – October 2002, (\$10,000).
- Carnegie Corporation, Project title: “MIT-Caltech Voting Technology Initiative”, 2000 – 2001, Co-principal Investigator, (\$450,000).

- USC-Caltech Center for the Study of Law and Politics, Associate Director, 2000 (\$150,000) 2001 (\$150,000), 2002 (\$150,000).
- USC Center for Law, Communications, and Public Policy, “Manufacturing a Gender Gap”, 1999, Co-principal Investigator (\$8,500).
- John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation Faculty Fellowship, Project title: “An Experiment in Democracy: The Blanket Primary in California”, 1999, (\$8,000).
- National Science Foundation, Project title: “Issues and Economics in Multiparty Elections”, 1997-99, Co-principal Investigator, (\$85,000).
- IBM University Equipment Matching Grants Program, 1998, (\$25,000).
- John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation Faculty Fellowship, Project title: “Who Governs Southern California: Will the Rise of Latino Political Power Continue?” 1997, (\$8,000).
- IBM University Equipment Grants Program, Project title: “Individuals and Aggregates: New Computational Techniques for Resolving Ecological Relationships”, 1996 – 97, Co-principal Investigator, (\$134,000).
- John M. Olin Faculty Fellowship, 1994 – 95, (\$45,000).
- John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation Faculty Fellowship, Project title: “Information in State-Level Political Campaigns: An Examination of the 1994 Senate and Gubernatorial Races in California”, 1994, (\$8,000).
- Duke Endowment Fellow, 1987 – 89.

[PROFESSIONAL HONORS]

- Google Cloud Research Innovator, 2022.
- Best Paper Prize “Fuzzy Forests for Feature Selection in High-Dimensional Survey Data: An Application to the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election” at the AMLDA 2021 conference (with Sreemanti Dey).
- American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Fellow, 2018.
- Society for Political Methodology Excellence in Mentoring Award, 2017.
- Caltech Graduate Student Council Mentoring Award, 2014-2015.
- Best Paper Prize “*From Piloting to Roll-out: Voting Experience and Trust in the First Full e-election in Argentina*” at the EVOTE2014 conference in Lochau/Bregenz, Austria, 2014.
- Fellow of the Society for Political Methodology, 2010.
- Best Paper Prize “*Assessing the Impact of E-Voting Technologies on Electoral Outcome: An Analysis of Buenos Aires’ 2005 Congressional Election*” at the EVOTE2008 conference in Bregenz, Austria, 2008
- Caltech Graduate Student Council Mentoring Award, 2006-07
- Named and recognized by *Scientific American* magazine for outstanding acts of leadership in science and technology as a Policy Leader in the computing category of the 2004 “*Scientific American 50*”.
- Emerging Scholar Award, Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior Section of the American Political Science Association, for the top scholar within ten years of Ph.D. receipt in the field, 2002.
- Robert H. Durr Award for the best paper applying quantitative methods to a substantive problem in political science at the 1997 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.
- Sprague Award for the best paper applying quantitative methods to a substantive problem in political science at the 1995 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.
- Brooks/Cole Award for the best paper written by a graduate student in the 1991 Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association.
- Distinction in the Department of Political Science, Carleton College, 1986, awarded for thesis titled *Latin American Revolutions: Going Beyond Skocpol*.

[PUBLICATIONS]

-Books-

- *Securing American Elections: How Data-Driven Election Monitoring Can Improve Our Democracy.* With Nicholas Adams-Cohen, Seo-Young Silvia Kim, and Yimeng Li. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge Elements, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108887359>.
- *Oxford Handbook of Polling and Polling Methods.* Edited with Lonna Atkeson. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- *Computational Social Science: Discovery and Prediction.* Edited volume. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- *Nonpartisan Primary Election Reform: Mitigating Mischief.* With J. Andrew Sinclair. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- *Election Administration in the United States: The State of Reform after Bush v. Gore.* Edited with Bernard Grofman. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- *Evaluating Elections: A Handbook of Methods and Standards.* With Lonna Rae Atkeson and Thad E. Hall. Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- *Confirming Elections: Creating Confidence and Integrity Through Election Auditing.* Edited with Lonna Rae Atkeson and Thad E. Hall. Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- *New Faces, New Voices: The Hispanic Electorate in America.* With Marisa Abrajano. Princeton University Press, 2010.
- *Election Fraud: Detecting and Deterring Electoral Manipulation.* Edited with Thad E. Hall and Susan Hyde. Brookings University Press, 2008.
- *Electronic Elections: The Perils and Promises of Digital Democracy.* With Thad E. Hall. Princeton University Press, 2008.
- *Point, Click and Vote: The Future of Internet Voting.* With Thad E. Hall. Brookings Institution Press, 2004.
- *Hard Choices, Easy Answers: Values, Information, and American Public Opinion.* With John Brehm. Princeton University Press, 2002.
- *Information and Elections.* Revised Edition. University of Michigan Press, 1998.
- *Information and Elections.* University of Michigan Press, 1997.

Journal Articles-

- A Gladiator Arena: Incivility In the Canadian House of Commons. With Jacob Morrier. *Journal of Politics.* 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1086/732973>.
- Legislative Communication and Power: Measuring Leadership in the U.S. House of Representatives from Social Media Data. With Danny Ebanks, Betsy Sinclair, Sanmay Das and Hao Yan. *European Political Science Review.* 2025. doi:10.1017/S1755773924000146.
- American Views About Election Fraud in 2024. With Mitchell Linegar. *Frontiers in Political Science.* 2024. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.1493897>.
- Appealing to Independents: information on negative externalities increases support for environmental corrective taxes. With Beatrice Magistro. *Environmental Politics.* 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2024.2439686>.
- Electoral Innovation and the Alaska Electoral System: Partisanship and Populism Are Associated with Support for the Top-4, Ranked-Choice Voting System.” With Christian Grose, J. Andrew Sinclair, and Betsy Sinclair. *Political Research Quarterly.* 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10659129241263>.
- Partisanship is Why People Vote in Person in a Pandemic. With Seo-Young Silvia Kim and Akhil Bandreddi. *Social Science Quarterly.* 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.13380>.
- Identifying American Climate Change Free Riders and Motivating Sustainable Behavior. With Beatrice Magistro, Cecilia Abramson, Danny Ebanks and Ramit Debnath. *Scientific Reports.* 2024. <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-024-57042-w>.
- Challenges in Moderating Disruptive Player Behavior in Online Competitive Action Games. With Rafal Kocielnik, Zhuofang Li, Claudia Kann, Deshawn Sambrano, Jacob Morrier, Mitchell Linegar, Carly Taylor, Min Kim, Nabiha Naqvie, Feri Soltani, Arman Dehpanah, Grant Hill, and Animashree Anandkumar. *Frontiers in Computer Science, Human-Media Interaction.* February 23, 2024. Volume 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2024.1283735>.

- Persuadable Voters Decided the 2022 Midterm: Abortion Rights and Issues-Based Frameworks for Studying Election Outcomes. With Daniel Ebanks, Claudia Kann and Jacob Morrier. PLOS ONE. 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294047>.
- The Effect of Misinformation Intervention: Evidence from Trump's Tweets and the 2020 Election. With Zhuofang Li, Jian Cao, Nicholas Adams-Cohen. In: Ceolin, D., Caselli, T., Tulin, M. (eds) Disinformation in Open Online Media. MISDOOM 2023. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 14397. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-47896-3_7.
- Do Fossil Fuel Firms Reframe Online Climate and Sustainability Communication? A Data-Driven Analysis. With Ramit Debnath, Daniel Ebanks, Kamair Mohaddes and Thomas Roulet. *npj Climate Action*, 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44168-023-00086-x>.
- Large Language Models and Political Science. With Mitchell Linegar and Rafal Kocielnik. *Frontiers in Political Science (Research Methodologies in Political Science: The Challenge of AI)*. DOI: doi: 10.3389/fpos.2023.1257092.
- Why Don't Americans Trust University Researchers and Why It Matters for Climate Change. With Daniel Ebanks and Ramit Debnath. *PLOS Climate*. 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pclm.0000147>.
- Issue Responsiveness in Canadian Politics: Are Parties Responsive to the Public Salience of Climate Change in the Question Period". With Jacob Morrier. *Political Research Quarterly*. 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/10659129231194270>.
- Collective Identity in Collective Action: Evidence from the 2020 Summer BLM Protests. With Claudia Kann, Sarah Hashash, and Zachary Steinert-Threlkeld. *Frontiers in Political Science*. Volume 5, 2023. DOI: 10.3389/fpos.2023.1185633.
- AutoBiasTest: Controllable Sentence Generation for Automated and Open-Ended Social Bias Testing in Language Models. With Rafal Kocielnik, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Vivian Zhang and Anima Anandkumar. 2023. ICML 2023 Workshop on Deployable Challenges for Generative AI.
- "Conspiracy Spillovers and Geoengineering", with Ramit Debnath et al., *iScience*, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2023.106166>.
- "COVID-Dynamic: A Large-Scale Longitudinal Study of Socioemotional and Behavioral Change Across the Pandemic", with Tessa Rusch et al., *Scientific Data*, 10, 71, 2023.
- "Facilitating System-Level Behavioural Climate Action Using Computational Social Science", with Ramit Debnath, Sander van der Linden, and Benjamin K. Sovacool. *Nature Human Behavior*, correspondence, 7, 155-156, 2023.
- "GatherTweet: A Python Package for Collecting Social Media Data on Online Events", with Claudia Kann, Sarah Hashash, Zachary Steinert-Threlkeld, *Journal of Computer and Communications*, 11, 172-193, 2023.
- "Survey Attention and Self-Reported Political Behavior", with Yimeng Li. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 86(4), 2023, 793-811.
- "Can You Label Less by Using Out-of-Domain Data? Active & Transfer Learning with Few-shot Instructions", with Rafal Kocielnik, Sara Kangaslahti, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Meena Hari and Anima Anandkumar. NeurIPS Workshop on Transfer Learning for Natural Language Processing, 2022, New Orleans.
- "Social Media Enables People-Centric Climate Action in the Hard-to-Decarbonize Building Sector". With Ramit Debnath, Ronita Bardhan, Darshil U. Shah, Kamiar Mohaddes, Michael H. Ramage, and Benjamin K. Sovacool. *Scientific Reports*, 12, 19017, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-23624-9>.
- "Latinos, Group Identity, and Equal Opportunity on the 2020 California Ballot." With Jennifer Lopez and Seo-young Silvia Kim. *Social Science Quarterly*, <https://doi.org/10.1111.ssqu.13217>.
- "Voting Technologies and Election Administration in the U.S." *Oxford Bibliographies in Political Science*, forthcoming 2023.
- "Bayesian Analysis of State Voter Registration Database Integrity." With Jian Cao and Seo-young Silvia Kim. *Statistics, Politics and Policy*, <https://doi.org/10.1515/spp-2021-0016>.
- "Fuzzy Forests for Feature Selection in High-Dimensional Survey Data: An Application to the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election." With Sreemanti Dey, *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conferences on Applied Machine Learning and Data Analytics (AMLDA 2021)*, forthcoming 2023.
- "The Politics of Vaccine Hesitancy in the United States." With Jian Cao and Christina Ramirez. *Social Science Quarterly*, 103(1), 42-54.

- “Dynamic Social Media Monitoring for Fast-Evolving Online Discussions.” With Maya Srikanth, Anqi Liu, Nicholas Adams-Cohen, Jian Cao, and Anima Anandkumar. *KDD '21: Proceedings of the 27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, August 2021, pages 3576–3584, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3447548.3467171>.
- “Reliable and Efficient Long-Term Social Media Monitoring. With Jian Cao and Nicholas Adams-Cohen. *Journal of Computer and Communications*, 9, 97-109, doi:10.4236/jcc.2021.910006.
- “How (Not) to Reproduce: Practical Considerations to Improve Research Transparency in Political Science.” With Simon Heuberger. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 2021, doi:10.1017/S1049096521001062.
- “Why Do Election Results Change after Election Day? The “Blue Shift” in California Elections.” With Michelle Hyun and Yimeng Li. *Political Research Quarterly*, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1177/10659129211033340>.
- “Voting Experiences, Perceptions of Fraud, and Voter Confidence.” With Jian Can and Yimeng Li. *Social Science Quarterly*, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12940>.
- “Personality Traits Are Directly Associated with Anti-Black Prejudice in the United States.” With Chujun Lin, PLOS ONE, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0235436>.
- “Conventional and Unconventional Participation in Latin America: A Hierarchical Latent Class Approach.” With Gabriel Katz, Ines Levin, and Lucas Nunez. *Political Science Research and Methods*, <https://doi.org/10.1017/psrm.2020.35>.
- “Who Voted in 2016? Using Fuzzy Forests to Understand Voter Turnout.” With Seo-young Silvia Kim and Christina M. Ramirez. *Social Science Quarterly*, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12777>.
- “Hidden Donors: The Censoring Problem in U.S. Federal Campaign Finance Data.” With Jonathan N. Katz and Seo-Young Silvia Kim. *Election Law Journal*, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1089/elj.2019.0593>.
- “Abstention, Protest, and Residual Votes in the 2016 Election.” With Charles Stewart III, Stephen S. Pettigrew, and Cameron Wimpy, *Social Science Quarterly*, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1111/ssqu.12757>.
- “Finding Social Media Trolls: Dynamic Keyword Selection Methods for Rapidly-Evolving Online Debates.” AI For Social Good Workshop, *NeurIPS*, 2019. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.05332>.
- “Election Forensics: Using Machine Learning and Synthetic Data for Possible Election Anomaly Detection”. With Mali Zhang and Ines Levin. PLOS ONE, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223950>.
- “Using Machine Learning to Uncover Hidden Heterogeneities in Survey Data.” With Christina M. Ramirez and Marisa A. Abrajano. *Scientific Reports*, 9, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-51862-x>.
- “Evaluating the Quality of Changes in Voter Registration Databases.” With Seo-young Silvia Kim and Spencer Schneider. *American Political Research*, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X19870512>.
- “Waiting to Vote in the 2016 Presidential Election: Evidence from a Multi-County Study.” With Robert Stein, et al. *Political Research Quarterly*, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912919832374>.
- “The Impact of Personalized Information on Vote Intention: Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment.” With Joelle Pianzola, Alexander Trechsel, Guido Schwerdt, and Kristjan Vassil, *Journal of Politics*, 81(3), 833-847, July 2019.
- Paying Attention to Inattentive Survey Respondents.” With Lonna R. Atkeson, Ines Levin, and Yimeng Li. *Political Analysis*, <https://doi.org/10.1017/pan.2018.57>, January 2019.
- “Answering Questions About Race: How Racial and Ethnic Identities Influence Survey Response.” With Marisa A. Abrajano, *American Politics Research*, 2018, 47(2), 250-274.
- “Inferring Whether Officials Are Corruptible From Looking At Their Faces.” With Chujun Lin and Ralph Adolphs. *Psychological Science*, September 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2018.1460288>.
- “Fraud, Convenience, and e-voting: How Voting Experience Shapes Opinions About Voting Technology.” With Ines Levin and Yimeng Li, *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, May 2018, pages 94-105, <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2018.1460288>.
- “Low-Information Voting: Evidence from Instant-Runoff Elections.” With Ines Levin and Thad E. Hall, *American Politics Research*, March 2018, doi.org/10.1177/1532673X18759643.
- “Research Replication: Practical Considerations.” With Ellen Key and Lucas Nunez, *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51(2), 422-426, April 2018, doi:10.1017/S1049096517002566.
- “The Four Faces of Political Participation in Argentina: Using Latent Class Analysis to Study Political Behavior.” With Ines Levin and Lucas Nunez, *Journal of Politics*, <https://doi.org/10.1086/692786>, 2017.

- “Cultural Effects on The Association Between Election Outcomes and Face-Based Trait Inferences.” With Chujun Lin and Ralph Adolphs. *PLOS ONE*, July 10, 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0180837>
- “The Diffusion of Internet Voting. Usage Patterns of Internet Voting in Estonia Between 2005 and 2015.” With Kristjan Vassil, Mihkel Solvak, Priit Vinkel, Alexander H. Trechsel. *Government Information Quarterly*, 2016, 33(3), 453-459.
- “Participation in the Wake of Adversity: Blame Attribution and Policy-Oriented Evaluations.” With Ines Levin and J. Andrew Sinclair. *Political Behavior*, Vol. 38, No. 1, March 2016, 203-228.
- “Voter Confidence: How To Measure It and How It Differs From Government Support.” With Lonna Rae Atkeson and Thad E. Hall. *Election Law Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 3, September 2015, 207-219.
- “Where the good signatures are: Signature collection and initiative qualification in California. With Frederick J. Boehmke. *The Social Science Journal*, Vol. 52, No. 2, 2015, 248-257.
- “Mitigating Coercion, Maximizing Confidence in Postal Elections.” With Jacob Quinn Shenker. *JETS: The USENIX Journal of Election Technology and Systems*, Vol. 2, No. 3, July 2014, 57-73.
- “From Piloting to Roll-out: Voting Experience and Trust in the First Full e-election in Argentina.” With Julia Pomares, Ines Levin, Guillermo Lopez Mirau and Teresa Ovejero. In Krimmer, R., Volkamer, M.: Proceedings of Electronic Voting 2014 (EVOTE2014), TUT Press, Tallinn, p. 33-42.
- “Nonresponse and Mode Effects in Self and Interviewer Administered Surveys.” With Lonna R. Atkeson and Alex Adams. *Political Analysis*, Vol 22, No. 3, 2014, 304-320.
- “Balancing Fraud Prevention and Electoral Participation: Attitudes Towards Voter Identification.” With Lonna Rae Atkeson, Thad E. Hall, and J. Andrew Sinclair. *Social Science Quarterly*, vol. 95, Issue 5, 2014, 1381-1398.
- “Do Voters and Poll Workers Differ in their Attitudes Toward E-voting? Evidence from the First E-election in Salta, Argentina.” With Julia Pomares and Ines Levin. *JETS: The USENIX Journal of Election Technology and Systems*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 2014, 1-10.
- “Party Preferences in the Digital Age: The Impact of Voting Advice Applications.” With Ines Levin, Peter Mair and Alexander H. Trechsel. *Party Politics*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 2014, 227-236.
- “Voting Advice Applications: How Useful and For Whom?” With Ines Levin, Alexander H. Trechsel, and Kristjan Vassil. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, Vol 11, No 1, 2014, 82-101.
- “The Influence of Initiative Signature Gathering Campaigns on Political Participation.” With Frederick J. Boehmke. *Social Science Quarterly*, Vol. 95, No. 1, 2014, 165-183.
- “Voting Made Safe and Easy: The Impact of E-voting on Citizen Perceptions.” With Julia Pomares, Marcelo Leiras and Ines Levin. *Political Science Research Methods*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 117-37.
- “Who Are California’s Decline to State Voters?” With J. Andrew Sinclair. *California Journal of Politics and Policy*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 2013, 47-66.
- “Voting Technology, Vote-by-Mail, and Residual Votes in California, 1990-2010.” With Dustin Beckett and Charles Stewart III. *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 66, No. 3, September 2013, 658-670.
- “Electoral Institutions and Legislative Behavior: The Effects of Primary Processes.” With Betsy Sinclair. *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 65, No. 3, 2012, 544-557.
- “Thin Slice Decisions Do Not Need Faces to be Predictive of Election Outcomes.” With Michael L. Spezio, Laura Loesch, Frederic Gosselin, and Kyle Mattes. *Political Psychology*, Vol. 33, No. 3, 2012, 331-341.
- “Making Voting Easier: Convenience voting in the 2008 Presidential Election.” With Ines Levin and J. Andrew Sinclair, *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 65, No. 2, 2012, 248-262.
- “Hispanic Public Opinion and Partisanship in America.” With Marisa Abrajano. *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 126, No. 2, Summer 2011, 255-286.
- “Voter Opinions about Election Reform: Do They Support Making Voting More Convenient?” With Thad E. Hall, Ines Levin and Charles Stewart III. *Election Law Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 2, June 2011, 73-87.
- “Assessing the Impact of Alternative Voting Technologies on Multi-Party Elections: Design Features, Heuristic Processing and Voter Choice.” With Ernesto Calvo, Marcelo Escolar, Gabriel Katz and Julia Pomares, *Political Behavior*, Vol. 33, 2011, 247-270.
- “The Impact of New Technologies on Voter Confidence in Latin America: Evidence from E-Voting Experiments in Argentina and Colombia.” With Gabriel Katz and Julia Pomares, *Journal of Information Technology and Politics*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2011, 199-217.

- “Flooding the Vote: Hurricane Katrina and Voter Participation in New Orleans.” With Thad E. Hall and Betsy Sinclair, *American Politics Research*, Vol. 39, No. 5, 921-957.
- “An Empirical Bayes Approach to Estimating Ordinal Treatment Effects.” With Delia Bailey and Jonathan N. Katz, *Political Analysis*, Vol. 19, No 1. 2011, 20-31.
- “A New Barrier to Participation: Heterogeneous Application of Voter Identification Policies.” With Lonna Rae Atkeson, Lisa Ann Bryant, Thad E. Hall and Kyle Saunders, *Electoral Studies*, Vol 29, No. 1, 2010, 66-73.
- “Mobilizing Pasadena Democrats: Measuring the Effects of Partisan Campaign Contacts.” With Betsy Sinclair and Asa Hopkins, *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 72, 2010, 31-44.
- “Predicting Election Outcomes from Positive and Negative Trait Assessments of Candidate Images.” With Kyle Mattes, Michael Spezio, Hackjin Kim, Alexander Todorov and Ralph Adolphs, *Political Psychology*, Vol. 31, No 1., 2010, 41-58.
- “Assessing the Causes and Effects of Political Trust Among U.S. Latinos.” With Marisa A. Abrajano, *American Politics Research*, Vol. 38, No. 1, 2010, 110-141.
- “Detecting Voter Fraud in an Electronic Voting Context: An Analysis of the Unlimited Reelection Vote in Venezuela.” With Ines Levin, Gabe A. Cohen and Peter Ordeshook. Online proceedings, EVT/WOTE '09, <http://www.usenix.org/event/evtwote09/tech/>.
- “Interstate Voter Registration Database Matching: The Oregon-Washington 2008 Pilot Project.” With Jeff Jonas, William E. Winkler, and Rebecca N. Wright. Online proceedings, EVT/WOTE '09, <http://www.usenix.org/event/evtwote09/tech/>.
- “Internet Voting in Comparative Perspective: The Case of Estonia.” With Thad E. Hall and Alexander H. Trechsel, *PS: Political Science & Politics*, Vol. 42, 2009, 497-505.
- “Structural cleavages, electoral competition and partisan divide: a Bayesian multinomial probit analysis of Chile’s 2005 election”. *Electoral Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 2, June 2009, 177-189.
- “Rationality and Rationalistic Choice in the California Recall”, With D. Roderick Kiewiet. *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 39, 2009, 267-290.
- “A neural basis for the effect of candidate appearance on election outcomes.” With Michael L. Spezio, Antonio Rangel, John P. O’Doherty, Kyle Mattes, Alexander Todorov, Hackjin Kim and Ralph Adolphs. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, Dec. 2008, 3(4): 344-352.
- “Whose Absentee Votes Are Counted: The Variety and Use of Absentee Ballots in California.” With Thad Hall, Betsy Sinclair, *Electoral Studies*, 2008 27, 4: 673-683.
- “Building Secure and Transparent Elections Through Standard Operating Procedures”, With Thad E. Hall, *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 68, No. 5, September/October 2008: 828-838.
- “The Hispanic Vote in the 2004 Presidential Election: Insecurity and Moral Concerns”, with Marisa A. Abrajano and Jonathan Nagler. *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 70, No. 2, April 2008: 368-382.
- “Who Should Run Elections in the United States”, with Thad Hall & Morgan Llewellyn. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 36, No. 3, August 2008 Pp. 325-346.
- “Are Americans Confident Their Ballots Are Counted?” with Thad Hall, Morgan Llewellyn. *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 70, No. 3, July 2008, Pp. 754-766.
- “Military Voting and the Law: Procedural and Technological Solutions to the Ballot Transit Problem” with Thad E. Hall and Brian F. Roberts. *Fordham Law Review*, Vol. 34, No. 3, April 2007.
- “Bridging Science, Technology, and Politics in Election Systems”, Michael Alvarez & Erik Antonsson. *The Bridge* (National Academy of Engineering). Vol. 37, No. 2 (Summer 2007).
- “How Hard Can It Be: Do Citizens Think It Is Difficult To Register To Vote?” with Thad Hall, Morgan Llewellyn. *Stanford Law & Policy Review*. Vol. 18, No. 349 (2007).
- “Controlling Democracy: The Principal-agent Problems In Election Administration.” With Thad Hall, *Policy Studies Journal*. Nov 2006, Vol. 34, No. 4: 491-510.
- “How Much is Enough? The ‘Ballot Order Effect’ and the use of Social Science Research in Election Law Disputes.” With Betsy Sinclair and Richard Hasen. *Election Law Journal*, Mar 2006, Vol. 5, No. 1: 40-56.
- “Strategic Voting in British Elections.” With Fred Boehmke and Jonathan Nagler. *Electoral Studies*, 2006, Vol. 25: 1-19.
- “Voting Behavior and the Electoral Context of Government Formation: The 1994 Dutch Parliamentary Election and the ‘Purple Coalition’.” With Garrett Glasgow. *Electoral Studies*, 2005, Vol. 24: 245-264.
- “Rational and Pluralistic Approaches to HAVA Implementation: The Cases of Georgia and California.” With Thad Hall. *Publius*. Vol. 35, No. 4: 559-577.

- “A Natural Experiment of Race-Based and Issue Voting: The 2001 City of Los Angeles Elections.” With Marisa A. Abrajano and Jonathan Nagler. *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No. 2, 2005, 203-218
- “Web-Based Surveys.” With Carla VanBeselaere. *Encyclopedia of Social Measurement*, Vol. 3, 2005, 955-962.
- “Studying Elections: Data Quality and Pitfalls in Measuring the Effects of Voting Technologies,” With Stephen Ansolabehere and Charles Stewart III. *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (February 2005), 15-24.
- “Latinos, Anglos, Voters, Candidates, and Voting Rights.” With Jonathan Nagler. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*. Vol. 153, No. 1 (November 2004), 393-432.
- “Party System Compactness: Measurement and Consequences.” With Jonathan Nagler. *Political Analysis*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Winter 2004), 46-62.
- “The Race Gap in Student Achievement Scores: Longitudinal Evidence from a Racially Diverse Environment.” With Valentina Bali, *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 3 (August 2004), 393-416.
- “The Revolution Against Affirmative Action in California: Politics, Economics, and Proposition 209.” With Lisa García Bedolla. *State Politics and Policy Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Spring 2004), 1-17.
- “Who Overvotes, Who Undervotes, Using Punchcards? Evidence from Los Angeles County.” With Betsy Sinclair. *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 1 (March 2004), 15-25.
- “The Complexity of the California Recall Election.” With Melanie Goodrich, Thad E. Hall, D. Roderick Kiewiet, and Sarah M. Sled. *PSOnline*, (www.apsanet.org), January 2004.
- “Schools and Educational Outcomes: What Causes the “Race Gap” in Student Test Scores?” With Valentina A. Bali. *Social Science Quarterly*, September 2003, vol. 84, no. 3, 485-507.
- “Are There Sex Differences in Fiscal Political Preferences?” With Edward J. McCaffery. *Political Research Quarterly*, March 2003, vol. 56, no. 1, 5-17.
- “The Foundations of Latino Voter Partisanship: Evidence from the 2000 Election.” With Lisa García Bedolla. *Journal of Politics*, February 2003, vol. 65, no. 1, 31-49.
- “Subject Acquisition for Web-Based Surveys.” With Robert Sherman and Carla VanBeselaere. *Political Analysis*, vol. II, no. 1, Winter 2003.
- “The Likely Consequences of Internet Voting for Political Representation.” With Jonathan Nagler. *Loyola Law Review*, April 2001, vol. 34, no. 3, 1115-1153.
- “Issues, Economics and the Dynamics of Multi-Party Elections: The British 1987 General Election.” With Jonathan Nagler and Shaun Bowler. *American Political Science Review*, March 2000, vol. 94, no. 1, 131-150.
- “The Resurgence of Nativism in California? The Case of Proposition 187 and Illegal Immigration.” With Tara Butterfield. *Social Science Quarterly*, March 2000, vol. 81, no. 1, 167-179.
- “Two-Stage Estimation of Non-Recursive Choice Models.” With Garrett Glasgow. *Political Analysis*, Spring 2000, vol. 8, no. 2, 147-166.
- “Measuring the Relative Impact of Issues and the Economy in Democratic Elections.” With Jennifer Niemann and Jonathan Nagler. *Electoral Studies*, June-September, 2000, vol. 19, no. 2-3, 237-253.
- “A New Approach for Modeling Strategic Voting in Multiparty Elections.” With Jonathan Nagler. *British Journal of Political Science*, January 2000, vol. 30, no. 1, 57-75.
- “Uncertainty and Candidate Personality Traits.” With Garrett Glasgow. *American Politics Quarterly*, January 2000, vol. 28, no. 1, 26-49.
- “Citizenship and Political Representation in Contemporary California.” With Tara L. Butterfield. *Pacific Historical Review*, May 1999, vol. 68, no. 2, 293-308.
- “Explaining the Gender Gap in U.S. Presidential Elections, 1980-1992.” With Carole Chaney and Jonathan Nagler. *Political Research Quarterly*, June 1998, vol. 51, no. 2, 311-339.
- “Speaking in Two Voices: American Equivocation about the Internal Revenue Service.” With John Brehm. *American Journal of Political Science*, April 1998, vol. 42, no. 2, 418-452.
- “Economics, Entitlements and Social Issues: Voter Choice in the 1996 Presidential Election.” With Jonathan Nagler. *American Journal of Political Science*, October 1998, vol. 42, no. 4, 1349-1363.
- “When Politics and Models Collide: Estimating Models of Multicandidate Elections.” With Jonathan Nagler. *American Journal of Political Science*, January 1998, vol. 42, no. 1, 55-96.
- “Deficits, Democrats, and Distributive Benefits: Congressional Elections and the Pork Barrel in the 1980s.” With Jason Saving. *Political Research Quarterly*, December 1997, vol. 50, no. 4, 809-832.
- “Congressional Committees and the Political Economy of Federal Outlays.” With Jason Saving. *Public Choice*, August 1997, vol. 92, no. 1-2, 55-73.

- “Are Americans Ambivalent Towards Racial Policies?” With John Brehm. *American Journal of Political Science*, April 1997, vol. 40, no. 2, 345-374.
- “Constituents and Legislators: Learning About the Persian Gulf War Resolution.” With Paul W. Gronke. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, February 1996, vol. 21, no. 1, 105-127.
- “American Ambivalence Towards Abortion Policy: Development of a Heteroskedastic Probit Model of Competing Values.” With John Brehm. *American Journal of Political Science*, November 1995, vol. 39, no. 4, 1055-1082.
- “Voter Choice in 1992: Economics, Issues and Anger.” With Jonathan Nagler. *American Journal of Political Science*, August 1995, vol. 39, no. 3, 714-744.
- “Issues and the Presidential Primary Voter.” With John Aldrich. *Political Behavior*, September 1994, vol. 16, no. 3, 289-317.
- “Uncertainty and Political Perceptions.” With Charles Franklin. *Journal of Politics*, August 1994, vol. 56, no. 4, 671-689.
- “Government Partisanship, Labor Organizations and Macroeconomic Performance, A Corrigendum.” With Nathaniel Beck, Jonathan N. Katz, Geoffrey Garrett, and Peter Lange. *American Political Science Review*, December 1993, vol. 87, no. 4, 945-948.
- “Policy Moderation or Conflicting Expectations: Testing the Intentional Models of Ticket-Splitting.” With Matthew M. Schousen. *American Politics Quarterly*, October 1993, vol. 21, no. 4, 410-438.
- “Government Partisanship, Labor Organization and Macroeconomic Performance, 1967-1984.” With Geoffrey Garrett and Peter Lange. *American Political Science Review*, June 1991, vol. 85, no. 2, 539-556. Reprinted in: Carlos Boix (ed.), *Modelos Politico-Institucionales de Politica Economica* (Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Fiscales, 1994), and Ronald Rogowski (ed.), *Comparative Politics and the International Political Economy* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 1994).
- “The Puzzle of Party Identification: Dimensionality of an Important Concept.” *American Politics Quarterly*, October 1990, vol. 18, no. 4, 476-491.

Selected Research Reports and Monographs-

- “California Voter’s Choice Act: Los Angeles County March Primary 2020 Evaluation.” With Jian Cao, Daniel Ebanks, Daniel Guth, and Yimeng Li. January 2021. Sponsored by the California Secretary of State.
- “California Voter’s Choice Act: Los Angeles County November General 2020 Evaluation.” With Jian Cao, Daniel Ebanks and Yimeng Li. June 2021. Sponsored by the California Secretary of State.
- “Election Science: A Proposed NSF Convergence Accelerator.” With Moon Duchin, Grechen Macht, and Charles Stewart III. July 21, 2021. <https://vote.caltech.edu/reports/12>.
- “Make Sure That Your Vote Is Counted in 2020.” Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project, October 2020. <https://bit.ly/2ZJc94N>.
- “UOCAVA Electronic Ballot Transmission: Recommendations to Mitigate Security Risks”, The Turnout, supported by the Democracy Fund, February 2019.
- “The Voting Technology Project: Looking Back, Looking Ahead.” Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project, July 2016.
- “Voting: What Has Changed, What Hasn’t, & What Needs Improvement.” Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project, October 2012.
- “Cambios en la forma de votar. La experiencia del voto electronico en Salta.” Research in association with Julia Pomares, Marcelo Leiras, Maria Page, Carolina Tchintian and Anastasia Peralta Ramos, CIPPIC, 2011.
- “Election Day Voter Registration in Hawaii.” With Jonathan Nagler. Prepared for Demos. February 2011.
- “Assessing Electoral Performance in New Mexico Using an Ecosystem Approach.” With Lonna Rae Atkeson and Thad E. Hall. April 2010.
- “Same Day Voter Registration in Maryland.” With Jonathan Nagler. Prepared for Demos. February 2010.
- “Same Day Voter Registration in New Mexico.” With Jonathan Nagler. Prepared for Demos. January 2010.
- “Making Voter Registration Easier: Evaluation of the Welcome Kit Voter Registration Pilot Project.” With Thad E. Hall and Morgan H. Llewellyn. January 2010.

- “Internet Voting in Estonia: A Comparative Analysis of Four Elections Since 2005.” With Alexander H. Trechsel, Kristjan Vassil, Guido Schwerdt, and Fabian Breuer. Jan 2010.
- “Provisional Voting in New Mexico.” With Lonna Rae Atkeson and Thad Hall. Pew Center on the States, *Provisional Ballots: An Imperfect Solution*, August 2009.
- “Provisional Ballots in the 2008 Ohio General Election.” With Thad E. Hall. Pew Center on the States, *Provisional Ballots: An Imperfect Solution*, August 2009.
- “The New Mexico 2006 Post Election Audit Report.” With Lonna Rae Atkeson and Thad E. Hall. September 2008.
- “Election Day Voter Registration in Nebraska.” With Jonathan Nagler. Prepared for Demos, April 2008.
- “Election Day Registration in Massachusetts.” With Jonathan Nagler. Prepared for Demos, March 2008.
- “Election Day Voter Registration in Iowa.” With Jonathan Nagler. Prepared for Demos, November 2007.
- “Same Day Voter Registration in North Carolina.” With Jonathan Nagler. Prepared for Demos, November 2007.
- “The New Mexico Election Administration Report: The 2006 November General Election.” With Lonna Rae Atkeson and Thad E. Hall. August 2007.
- “Internet Voting in the March 2007 Parliamentary Elections in Estonia.” With Alexander H. Trechsel, Guido Schwerdt, Fabian Breuer, and Thad E. Hall. Prepared for the Council of Europe, August 2007.
- “Election Day Voter Registration in Iowa.” With Jonathan Nagler. Prepared for Demos, March 2007.
- “DRE Analysis for May 2006 Primary, Cuyahoga County, Ohio.” Prepared for Election Science Institute, August 2006.
- “American Confidence in Electronic Voting and Ballot Counting: A Pre-Election Update.” With Thad E. Hall and Morgan Llewellyn. November 2006.
- “Improving the Election Day Survey.” With Thad E. Hall. March 2006.
- “Making Voting Easier: Election Day Registration in New York.” With Jonathan Nagler and Catherine Wilson. Prepared for Demos, May 2004.
- “California Votes: Election Day Registration in California.” With Stephen Ansolabehere. Prepared for Demos, May 2002.
- “Voting: What is, What Could Be.” Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project, June 2001.
- “Bush’s Tax Cut.” With Edward J. McCaffery. Prepared for the USC-Caltech Center for the Study of Law and Politics, 2001.
- “American Opinion About Election Reform.” Prepared for USC-Caltech Center for the Study of Law and Politics, 2001.
- “California’s Blanket Primary.” With Jonathan Nagler. Prepared for the California Secretary of State, 1998.

-Unrefereed Publications and Chapters in Edited Volumes-

- “Working Group Statement on Developing Standards for Internet Ballot Return”, Center for Security in Politics, University of California, Berkeley. <https://csp.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Working-Group-Statement-on-Internet-Ballot-Return.pdf>.
- “Continued Transparency Needed on CA’s Election Voting System.” With Kim Alexander. Sacramento Bee, op-ed, September 14, 2021.
- “Successful Cessation Programs that Reduce Comorbidity may Explain Surprisingly Low Smoking Rates among Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients.” With Bruce Cohen, Aaron Nichols, Stephen Grant, Zach Blumenfeld, Dennis Dougherty, Beate Ritz, and Henry Lester. Qeios, May 27, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.32388/WURFH0>.
- “Computational Social Science”, with Seo-young Silvia Kim. In *Oxford Bibliographies in Political Science*. Edited by Sandy Maisel. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019, DOI: 10.1093/OBO/9780199756223-0285.
- “The Future of Voting”, *The Wall Street Journal*, November 4, 2016.
- “Preferences, Constraints, and Choices: Tactical Voting in Mass Elections.” With D. Roderick Kiewiet and Lucas Nunez. In Justin Fisher, editor. *Handbook of Public Opinion and Voting Behaviour*. New York: Routledge, forthcoming.

- “Publishing tips from a journal editor: selecting the right journal.” *In The OUPblog Tenth Anniversary Book*, edited by Alice Northover. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015, pages 111-114.
- “Using Machine Learning Algorithms to Detect Election Fraud.” With Ines Levin and Julia Pomares. In R. Michael Alvarez, editor. *Computational Social Science: Discovery and Prediction*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- “Resolving Voter Registration Problems: Making Registration Easier, Less Costly, and More Accurate.” With Thad E. Hall. In R. Michael Alvarez and Bernard Grofman, editors. *Election Administration in the United States: The State of Reform after Bush v. Gore*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- “Democracia directa en California. Pasado, Presente y Futuro.” With Welmar E. Rosado Buenfil. In Alfonso Ayala Sanchez, editor. *Nuevas Avenidas de la Democracia Contemporanea*. Instituto de Investigaciones Juridicas, Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, 2014.
- “Introduction to Political Analysis Mini-Symposium on Advanced in Survey Methodology.” With Lonna Rae Atkeson. *Political Analysis*, Vol. 22, No. 3, 2014, 281-284.
- “Why Did Proposition 19 Fail?” With Jaclyn Kimble and J. Andrew Sinclair. In Katherine Tate, James Lance Taylor, and Mark Q. Sawyer, *Something’s in the Air: Race and the Legalization of Marijuana*. Routledge, 2013.
- “Machines Versus Humans: The Counting and Recounting of Pre-Scored Punchcard Ballots.” With Jonathan N. Katz, Sarah A. Hill and Erin K. Hartman. In R. Michael Alvarez, Lonna Rae Atkeson and Thad E. Hall, editors, *Confirming Elections: Creating Confidence and Integrity Through Election Auditing*, Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming 2011.
- “Comprehensive Audits.” With Lonna Rae Atkeson, Thad E. Hall and Jessica Taverna. In R. Michael Alvarez, Lonna Rae Atkeson, and Thad E. Hall, editors, *Confirming Elections: Creating Confidence and Integrity Through Election Auditing*, Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming 2011.
- “The New Mexico Pilot Project.” With Lonna Rae Atkeson and Thad E. Hall. In R. Michael Alvarez, Lonna Rae Atkeson, and Thad E. Hall, editors, *Confirming Elections: Creating Confidence and Integrity Through Election Auditing*, Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming 2011.
- “Midiendo el desempeno electoral.” In *Demos: El Voto Electronico*. Veracruz, MX, November 2010-January 2011, pp. 84-93.
- “Evaluacion del impacto de las nuevas tecnologias en la confianza de los votantes latinoamericanos: un analisis experimental.” With Gabrial Katz and Julia Pomares. In *Demos: El Voto Electronico*. Veracrus, MX: November 2010-January 2011, pp. 28-41.
- “Assessing Voters’ Attitudes Towards Electronic Voting in Latin America: Evidence from Colombia’s 2007 E-Voting Pilot.” With Gabriel Katz, Ricardo Llamosa and Hugo E. Martinez. In *E-Voting and Identity*, Edited by Peter Y.A. Ryan and Berry Schoenmakers. Berlin Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 2009, pages 75-91.
- “Voting Technologies.” With Thad E. Hall. *The Oxford Handbook of American Elections and Political Behavior*. Edited by Jan E. Leighley, Oxford University Press, forthcoming.
- “Lessons and Trends in E-Voting: Initiatives in the U.S. and Abroad.” With Thad E. Hall. *E-Voting: Perspectives and Experiences*, Edited by S. Jaya Krishna and Naveen Kumar, The Icfai University Press, Hyderabad, India, 2008, 181-199.
- “Assessing the Impact of E-Voting Technologies on Electoral Outcomes: An Analysis of Buenos Aires’ 2005 Congressional Election.” With Gabriel Katz, Ernesto Calvo, Marcelo Escolar, and Julia Pomares. In Robert Krimmer and Rudiger Grimm, Editors, *3rd International Conference on Electronic Voting, Proceedings*. http://www.e-voting.cc/static/evoting/files/katz_alvarez_calvo_escolar_pomares_assesing-the-impact_47-62.pdf.
- “Voting Online Around the World.” With Thad E. Hall. *Voting in America, Volume 3. American Voting Systems in Flux: Debacles, Dangers, and Brave New Designs*. Edited by Morgan E. Felchner, Praeger Publishers, 2008, 137-143.
- “Discrete Choice Models”. With Garrett Glasgow. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, Edited by Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady and David Collier, Oxford University Press, 2008, 513-529.
- In *Election Fraud: Detecting and Deterring Electoral Manipulation* (edited with Thad E. Hall and Susan D. Hyde):
 - “Introduction: Studying Election Fraud” (with Thad E. Hall and Susan D. Hyde).

- "Measuring Perceptions of Election Threats: Survey Data From Voters and Elites" (with Thad E. Hall).
- "Correlates of Fraud: Studying State Election Fraud Allegations" (with Frederick J. Boehmke).
- "Fraud or Failure? What Incident Reports Reveal About Election Anomalies and Irregularities" (with D. Roderick Kiewiet, Thad E. Hall and Jonathan N. Katz).
- "The Case of the 2002 General Election" (with Jonathan N. Katz).
- "Conclusion: Understanding Election Fraud" (with Thad E. Hall and Susan D. Hyde).
- "Studying Statewide Political Campaigns", with Alexandra Shankster, in Henry E. Brady, Richard Johnston, editors, *Capturing Campaign Effects*, University of Michigan Press, 2006.
- "Rational Voters and the Recall Election." With D. Roderick Kiewiet and Betsy Sinclair, in Shawn Bowler and Bruce Cain, *Clicker Politics*, Prentice-Hall, published Aug 26 2005.
- "And now for something completely different for California elections: Other views: Commission would ease politicking" With Thad E. Hall, Special to *The Sacramento Bee*, published Tuesday, February 22, 2005.
- "Ambivalence as Internal Conflict." With Bethony Albertson and John Brehm, in Stephen C. Craig and Michael D. Martinez, *Ambivalence and the Structure of Political Opinion*, Palgrave Macmillan, December 2004.
- "Online Voting." With Thad Hall, in William Sims Bainbridge, *Berkshire Encyclopedia of Human-Computer Interaction*, Berkshire Publishing Group, 2004, 526-527.
- "Counting Ballots and the 2000 Election: What Went Wrong?" With Betsy Sinclair and Catherine H. Wilson, in A. Crigler et al., "Rethinking the Vote", Oxford University Press, 2004, 34-50.
- "Uncertainty and American Public Opinion", with John Brehm and Catherine Wilson, in B. Burden, *Uncertainty and American Politics*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Review of *The Initiative and Referendum in California, 1898-1998*, *Pacific Historical Review*, 2002.
- "Should I Stay or Should I Go? Crossover Voting in Assembly Races." With Jonathan Nagler, in B. Cain and E. Gerber, *California's Blanket Primary*, University of California Press, 2002.
- "Gender and Tax." With Edward J. McCaffery. In S. Tolleson-Rinehart and J. J. Josephson, editors, *Gender and American Politics*, M. E. Sharpe, 2000.
- Book review in *American Political Science Review*, 2000 (98:2), 463-464 of Cambridge University Press, *The Democratic Dilemma: Can Citizens Learn What They Need to Know?* 1998. Arthur Lupia and Mathew D. McCubbins.
- "Gender and Tax", with Edward J. McCaffery. 2000. In S. Tolleson-Ronhart and J. J. Josephson, editors, *Gender and American Politics*, M. E. Sharpe.
- Review of *Colorblind Injustice: Minority Voting Rights and the Undoing of the Second Reconstruction*, *Engineering and Science*, vol. LXII, no. 1-2, 1999, 54-55.
- Review of *Change and Continuity in the 1996 Elections*, *Political Science Quarterly*, Summer 1999, vol. 114, no. 2, 331.
- Review of *Political Analysis, Volume 5*. *American Political Science Review*, vol. 91, no. 3, 721-722.
- "Polmeth -- You've Come a Long Way, Baby." *The Political Methodologist*, Spring 1996, vol. 7, no. 2, 10-12.
- "The Role of Replication," in *Mistakes That Social Scientists Make*, edited by Richard Seltzer. New York: St. Martins Press, 1996.
- "Can Bush Hit a Home Run?" With Brian Loynd. *The Political Methodologist*, Spring-Summer 1994, vol. 5, no. 2, 2-4.
- "Methods Madness: Graduate Training and the Political Methodology Conferences." *The Political Methodologist*, Spring 1992, vol. 5, no. 1, 2-3.

[PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS]

- TexMeth 2024, "TensorLY-LDA: Analyzing Social Media Conversations at Scale with Online Tensor LDA", UT Dallas, February 23, 2024.
- Google AI Public Sector Connect, "Using Natural Language Processing to Study Protest Behavior", October 14, 2022.
- Society for Political Methodology Annual Conference (poster presentation), July 21-23, 2022, Washington University in St. Louis.

- UCLA Biostatistics Seminar, “Analyzing Social Media Conversations at Scale With Tensor LDA”, April 13, 2022.
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, (three paper presentations, hybrid), April 8-10, 2022.
- UCLA Biostatistics Seminar, “Survey Attention”, March 2, 2022.
- RRoCCET 21, Research Running on Cloud Compute & Emerging Technologies, “GCP Case Study: Studying COVID-19 Pandemic Misinformation and Protest Using Social Media Data, August 12, 2021, virtual conference.
- Fifth Annual Election Science, Reform, and Administration Conference (three posters), July 19-21, 2021, MIT Election Data Science Lab, virtual conference.
- Society for Political Methodology Annual Conference (poster presentation, paper discussant), July 13-16, 2021, NYU, virtual conference.
- “Innovation in the Election Industry: What’s Next?” (presentation), July 13, 2021, Auburn University, webinar.
- UCLA Big Data and Politics Seminar Series, “Legislative Communication and Power: Measuring Leadership in the U.S. House”, April 30, 2021, UCLA, virtual seminar.
- CSMaP Annual Conference (paper presentation), April 22-23, 2021, NYU, virtual conference.
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, (four paper presentations), April 16-17, 2021, virtual conference.
- NSF Elections Workshop, Lessons Learned: Navigating a Presidential Election Through a Pandemic”, (paper presentation, “Monitoring The Integrity of Voter Registration Data”, March 25, 2021, NYU, virtual workshop.
- PolMeth Europe 2021 University of Hamburg, (paper presentation), March 18, 2021, virtual conference.
- Caltech Earnest C. Watson Lecture Series, “Can America Have a Safe and Secure Presidential Election?”, October 7, 2020.
- Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, (paper and poster presentations) September 10-13, 2020, virtual conference.
- 2020 Conference of the Society for Political Methodology, University of Toronto, virtual conference (poster presentation), July 14-17 2020.
- University of Southern California, Political Institutions & Political Economy Collaborative, Election Administration and Technology Symposium, “Securing American Elections”, January 28, 2020.
- LUMACSS Launch Conference, University of Lucerne, “Computational Social Science”, November 11, 2019.
- 2019 Conference of the Society for Political Methodology, MIT (poster presentation and paper discussant), July 17-20, 2019.
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2019 (session chair and two paper presentations).
- Election Audit Summit, December 7-8, 2018, MIT (two presentations).
- Third Annual Southern California Methods Workshop, University of California Los Angeles, “Monitoring the Integrity of Voter Registration Databases Using Record Linkage”, October 12, 2018.
- 2018 Conference of the Society for Political Methodology, BYU (poster presentation), July 2018.
- University of Southern California, Parties & Partisanship in the Age of Trump Symposium, Beyond Parties Roundtable presentation, February 13, 2018.
- University of Southern California, Political Institutions & Political Economy Collaborative, “Why Did Residual Votes Increase in the 2016 Election”, February 6, 2018.
- University of California, Irvine, Institute for Mathematical Behavioral Sciences, “Strategy and Choice in Primary Elections”, November 2, 2017.
- Southern California Data Science Conference, “Persuasion Modeling”, October 22, 2017.
- University of Southern California, School of International Relations, “Election Forensics”, October 9, 2017.
- Second Annual Southern California Methods Workshop, University of California Santa Barbara, “Using Attention Filters to Improve the Quality of Survey Reporting”, September 19-20, 2017
- Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August-September 2017, San Francisco, CA (roundtable presentation and paper presentation).

- 2017 Conference of the Society for Political Methodology, University of Wisconsin-Madison (poster presentation), July 2017.
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2016, Chicago, IL (two paper presentations).
- USC Schwarzenegger Institute for State and Global Policy, “California U.S. Senate Race and the Top-Two Primary”, panelist, December 2, 2016.
- “Struggling with Data: Accessibility and Research Transparency.” MIT Institute for Data, Systems, and Society Launch Event, September 22, 2016.
- Society for Political Methodology Summer Meetings, July 2016, Rice University (Poster presentation).
- “2016 American Presidential Election & the Obama Presidency.” Carleton College, May 11, 2016 (panel discussion).
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2015, Chicago, IL (two paper presentations).
- Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 2015, San Francisco, CA (panel chair).
- University of Utah, Department of Political Science, May 29, 2015.
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2015, Chicago, IL (paper presentation).
- Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 2014, Washington, DC (roundtable presentation).
- “Blueprint to Implementation: Election Administration Reform for 2014, 2016, and Beyond.” University of Chicago Institute of Politics, May 2014.
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2014, Chicago, IL (two paper presentations).
- Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 2013, Chicago, IL (Paper presentations and roundtable).
- Society for Political Methodology Summer Meetings, July 2013, University of Virginia (Roundtable).
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2013, Chicago, IL (Editor’s Roundtable).
- Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, March 2013, Hollywood, CA (roundtable presentation).
- Keynote Address, “An Overview of the Election Technology Landscape”, NIST/EAC Future of Voting Systems Symposium, February 26-28, 2013, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD.
- United States Election Assistance Commission, “Roundtable Discussion --- Informing Change: A Review of Events and Issues of the 2012 Elections Cycle”, Washington, D.C., January 9, 2013 (roundtable presentation).
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2012, Chicago, IL (paper presentation).
- University of Connecticut, Department of Political Science, February 2012.
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2010, Chicago, IL (one paper presentation, one roundtable presentation).
- Annual Summer Meeting of The Society for Political Methodology, July 2010, University of Iowa (roundtable presentation).
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2010, Chicago, IL (one paper presentation).
- “Democracia Electoral: Hacia Una Nueva Agenda.” Instituto Electoral Vercruzano: Universidad Cristobal Colon, Veracruz, MX (October 15, 2009); H. Congreso del Estado, Xalapa, MX (October 16, 2009).
- Annual Summer Meeting of The Society for Political Methodology, July 2009, Yale University, New Haven, CT (paper presentation).
- Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 2008, Boston, MA (two paper presentation).
- Scarborough Society of Shepherd University, June 2008 (presentation).
- Brookings Institution, Governance Studies and Election Reform Project, “Election Fraud: Detecting and Deterring Electoral Manipulation”, May 2008 (presentation).

- European University Institute, "Innovations in Research on Political Behavior", April 2008 (two paper presentations).
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2008, Chicago, IL (two paper presentations).
- University of Iowa, Department of Political Science, February 2008.
- Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, July-August 2007, Chicago, IL
- Schloss Dagstuhl "Frontiers of Electronic Voting" Seminar in Germany. "Internet Voting in Estonia" (authored with Thad Hall and Alex Trechsel) and "Using Incident Reports to Detect Election Anomalies and Irregularities" (authored with Hall, Jonathan Katz, & Rod Kiewiet)
- Society for Political Methodology 24th Annual Summer Meeting, July 2007, Penn State University (discussant, panel)
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2007, (discussant, panels)
- National Academies of Engineering Symposium, The Impact of Technology on Voting and Elections in the 21st Century, with Erik Antonsson: "Bridging S&T and Politics in E-Voting." Irvine, CA, February 8, 2007
- Caltech/MIT VTP Conference: Voter Identification/Registration, Cambridge, MA, October 2006
- Caltech/MIT VTP Conference: Election Fraud, Salt Lake City, UT, September 2006
- 35th Annual IACREOT Conference (International Association of Clerks, Recorders, Election Officials and Treasurers), Panel Presentation: "Restoring Voter Confidence: Threat Identification, Analysis and Mitigation in the Practical World," July 2006
- Voices of Reform workshop, University of Southern California, April 2006
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2006 (three paper presentations)
- Election Assistance Commission meeting, Improving Election Survey, April 2006
- American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy-Brookings Institute Project on Election Reform Project Launch, February 2006
- Annual Meetings of the Western Political Science Association, March 2006 (two paper presentations)
- Commission on Federal Election Reform, Rice University, Houston, TX, July 2005 (testimony on voter registration).
- San Gabriel Valley Young Presidents Organization, Pasadena, October 2004 (presentation).
- "The 2004 Election: What Does It Mean for Campaigns and Governance?" USC Law School Conference, October 2004 (presentation).
- Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project Symposium, "Voting Technology: Innovations for Today and Tomorrow", presentation and session leader, MIT, October 2004.
- JustDemocracy workshop presentation, Harvard University, October 2004.
- League of Women Voters of Los Angeles Forum, September 10, 2004. Keynote speaker.
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 2004 (roundtable presentation).
- The National Academies workshop on "A Framework for Understanding Electronic Voting", Washington DC, July 2004 (paper presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2004 (paper presentation).
- University of Michigan, Department of Political Science, January 2004 (presentation).
- "Digital Divide, Global Development and the Information Society", World Forum on Information Society, International Research Foundation for Development, Geneva, Switzerland, December 2003 (paper presentation).
- Internet Survey Workshop, Pacific Chapter of American Association for Public Opinion Research, October 2003 (Presentation).
- Modeling the Constitution Conference. California Institute of Technology, May 2003 (Discussant).
- Earnest C. Watson Lecture, "Voting: Where We Have Been, Where We Are Going", California Institute of Technology, April 2003 (presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2003 (two paper presentations).
- Election Reform, Cantigny Conference, November 2002 (presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 2002 (three paper presentations).
- Election Law Summit, Washington D.C., June 2002 (presentation).
- American Empirical Seminar Series, Stanford University, Stanford Institute for the Quantitative Study of Society, May 2002 (presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2002 (paper presentation).

- California Association of Election Officials, Los Angeles, April 2002 (presentation).
- Southern California Political Methodology Program, University of California, Riverside, October 2001 (paper presentation).
- City Clerk Summit III, Los Angeles County Registrar-Recorder, October 2001 (presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, September 2001 (two paper presentations).
- Democratic Caucus Special Committee on Election Reform, “Making Every Vote Count!” Los Angeles, CA, August 2001 (testimony).
- United States Senate, Committee on Governmental Affairs, Hearings on Election Reform, May 3, 2001 (written and oral testimony).
- Election Reform: 2000 and Beyond. USC-Caltech Center for the Study of Law and Politics, University of Southern California, April 2001 (paper presentation, panel session moderator).
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2001 (paper presentation).
- National Commission on Election Reform, April 2001 (testimony on new technology for elections).
- Pasadena Rotary, March 28, 2001 (presentation).
- Voting Technology Conference, Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project, March 2001 (panel session moderator).
- Annual Meetings of the Western Political Science Association, March 2001 (paper presentation).
- Internet Voting and Democracy, Loyola Law School, October 2000 (paper presentation).
- e-Voting Workshop, Internet Policy Institute, Sponsored by the National Science Foundation, conducted in cooperation with the University of Maryland and hosted by the Freedom Forum, October 2000 (panel discussion chair and research presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 2000 (two paper presentations).
- California Voting in the 21st Century, Los Angeles, May 2000 (research presentation on Internet voting).
- Southern California Political Methodology Program, University of California, Santa Barbara, May 2000 (paper presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 2000 (paper presentation).
- University of New Mexico, Political Science Department, April 2000.
- Annual Meetings of the Western Political Science Association, March 2000 (paper presentation, roundtable presentation).
- Southern California Political Methodology Program, UCLA Lake Arrowhead Conference Center, December 1999 (paper presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, September 1999 (paper presentation, discussant).
- Southern California Political Methodology Program, California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo, May 1999 (paper presentation).
- Center for Basic Research in the Social Sciences, Harvard University, April 1999.
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 1999 (paper presentation, discussant).
- Annual Meetings of the Western Political Science Association, March 1999 (paper presentation).
- Public Policy Institute of California, March 1999.
- University of Southern California, March 1999.
- Yale Law School, Yale University, February 1999.
- “Campaign 1998: The California Governor’s Race”, The Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, January 1999 (paper presentation).
- “Proposition 227”, Center for U.S. – Mexican Studies, University of California, San Diego, January 1999 (paper presentation).
- Emory University, October 1998. Annual Meetings of the Southern Political Science Association, October 1998 (paper presentation, discussant).
- University of California, Irvine, Institute for Mathematical Behavioral Sciences, October 1998.
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, September 1998 (two paper presentations, discussant).
- Fifteenth Political Methodology Conference, July 1998 (discussant).
- “California’s Blanket-Open Primary: A Natural Experiment in Election Dynamics”, University of California at Berkeley, June 1998 (participant).

- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 1998 (four paper presentations, roundtable discussant, poster presentation).
- University of California at Santa Barbara, April 1998.
- Annual Meetings of the Western Political Science Association, March 1998 (two paper presentations, discussant).
- “Orange Empires: Miami and Los Angeles” Conference. The Huntington Library, San Marino, California, February 27-28, 1998 (paper presentation).
- University of California at Riverside, February 1998 (Southern California Political Methodology Group).
- The Annenberg School of Communication, University of Pennsylvania, October 1997.
- Duke University, October 1997.
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 1997 (two paper presentations).
- Fourteenth Political Methodology Conference, July 1997 (discussant).
- University of California at Los Angeles, April 1997 (Southern California Political Methodology Group).
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 1997.
- University of Michigan, March 1997.
- University of Arizona, December 1996.
- Annual Meetings of the Southern Political Science Association, November 1996 (three paper presentations.)
- University of Minnesota, October 1996 (Second CIC Interactive Video Methods Seminar broadcast to the University of Wisconsin--Madison, the University of Illinois, and Ohio State University).
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 1996 (three paper presentations, discussant).
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 1996 (four paper presentations).
- National Election Studies Research & Development Conference on Congressional Elections, Chicago, IL, March 1996 (paper presentation).
- Southern California Political Economy Seminar, University of California-Irvine, September 1995 (paper presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 1995 (one paper presentation, chair-discussant).
- Twelfth Political Methodology Conference, July 1995 (paper presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 1995 (three paper presentations).
- Annual Meeting of the Public Choice Society, April 1995 (paper presentation, discussant).
- Hoover Institution, Stanford University, February 1995.
- National Election Study Conference on the Impact of the Presidential Campaign, University of Pennsylvania, November 1994 (discussant).
- Southern California Political Economy Seminar, University of California--Irvine, October 1994 (discussant).
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 1994 (two paper presentations).
- Eleventh Political Methodology Conference, July 1994 (discussant).
- Annual Meetings of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 1994 (two paper presentations and chair of panel).
- Southern Political Science Association Annual Meeting, November 1993 (paper presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, September 1993 (two paper presentations).
- Tenth Political Methodology Conference, Florida State University, July 1993 (paper presentation).
- University of California at San Diego, June 1993.
- University of California at Riverside, May 1993.
- Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, April 1993 (two paper presentations).
- Western Political Science Association Annual Meeting, April 1993 (chair of panel and discussant).
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 1992 (chair of roundtable and paper presentation).
- Ninth Political Methodology Conference, Harvard University, July 1992 (paper presentation).
- Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meetings, Chicago, IL., April 1992 (two paper presentations).
- The Political Consequences of War, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., February 1992 (paper presentation).

- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 1991 (two paper presentations).
- Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, April 1991 (two paper presentations).
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 1990 (paper presentation and discussant).
- Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, April 1990 (paper presentation).
- Conference on Political Economics, National Bureau of Economic Research, February, 1990 (paper presentation).
- Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 1989 (paper presentation).
- Southern Political Science Association Annual Meeting, September 1988 (discussant).

[OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES]

- Host, *Election Science Office Hours* (webinar and podcast), 2024-2025.
- Carleton Connects, “The Integrity of American Elections”, September 21, 2022.
- PhD Thesis Defense Opponent, Iuliia Spycher-Krivosheva, “The Impact of Internet Voting on Election Administration: Directing Implementation Towards a Blessing or a Curse”, Tallinn University of Technology, Tallinn, Estonia, 2022.
- Society for Political Methodology, Vice President (2021-2023), President-Elect (2023-2025).
- Center for Inclusive Democracy, Inclusive Data Advisory Committee member, 2021-2022.
- California Secretary of State, State Audit Working Group, member, 2020-2021.
- American Political Science Association, 2021 Heinz I. Eulau Award (*American Political Science Review* best paper), committee member, 2021.
- “Can America Have A Safe and Secure Presidential Election?” Pasadena Rotary presentation, September 23, 2020.
- Co-Editor, Elements in Campaigns and Elections, Cambridge University Press, September 2020 – present.
- Society for Political Methodology, Publications Committee Chair, 2019-2021.
- Organizing Committee, Election Audit Summit, MIT, December 7-8, 2018.
- “2018 Elections.” Mayfield Sr. School presentation, November 8, 2018.
- Co-Editor, Elements in Quantitative and Computational Methods for Social Science, Cambridge University Press, May 2016 – present.
- Co-Editor, Political Analysis, January 4, 2010-December 31, 2017.
- “Election Reform in California: An Update.” Pasadena Rotary presentation, October 26, 2016.
- “Voting and Elections.” Mayfield Sr. School presentation, October 5, 2016.
- Midwest Political Science Association, Robert H. Durr Award, committee chair, 2016-2017.
- Society for Political Methodology Excellence in Mentoring Award, committee chair, 2015-2016.
- *EVOTE2014*, International Programme Committee Member, 2014.
- Editorial Board, *JETS: The Usenix Journal of Election Technology and Systems*, 2013-present.
- City of Pasadena, Redistricting Task Force member, 2011-2012 (mayoral appointee).
- Conference organizer, “Verifiable Elections and the Public.” Schloss Dagstuhl Seminar 11281, July 10, 2011-July 15, 2011.
- Elections, Public Opinion, and Voting Behavior Section Emerging Scholar Award Committee, 2009-2010.
- Guest Co-Editor, “Special Issue on Election Administration and Voting Technology”, *American Politics Research*, Volume 36, Number 4, July 2008
- “Winning The Hispanic Vote in 2008”, with Jonathan Nagler, *The Democratic Strategist*, June 13, 2008.
- Filing of Amicus Brief, with Lonna Rae Atkeson, Delia Bailey, Thad E. Hall and Andrew D. Martin in support of petitioners William Crawford et al and Indiana Democratic Party et al, (Supreme Court Hearing of Indiana Voter Identification Law), November 2007.
- Editorial Board Member, *The Open Political Science Journal*, November 2007.
- Member, American Political Science Association Benjamin E. Lippincott Award Committee, April 2006.
- Member, Pasadena Task Force on Good Government, Pasadena, CA, October 2005 to 2006.
- Invited International Observer of the E-Voting Pilot, Buenos Aires, Argentina, October 2005
- Academic Advisor to the Commission on Federal Election Reform, 2005.

- HAVA Section 301 Task Force member (State of California), November 2004.
- Committee member, National Commission on Elections and Voting, 2004.
- Committee member, National Research Council Computer Science and Telecommunications Board Committee, National Academy of Sciences, “A Framework for Understanding Electronic Voting”, 2004.
- Political Research Quarterly (PRQ) Editor Search Committee, 2004.
- Steering Committee member, The Commonwealth Club of California, 2004.
- Board of Scholars of the Initiative and Referendum Institute (IRI), University of Southern California, Winter 2002.
- Chair, Durr Award Committee, Midwest Political Science Association, 2003, 2004, 2005.
- Recall Election Symposium, Caltech-USC Center for the Study of Politics, September 2003.
- State Plan Advisory Committee member, Help America Vote Act (HAVA), Spring 2003.
- Co-director, Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project, Fall 2002-present.
- Advisory Board, The Reform Institute, Advisory Board, 2001.
- Participant, Federal Voting Assistance Program, Voting Over the Internet, Peer Review Workshop, March 14, 2001.
- USC-Caltech Center for the Study of Law and Politics, Faculty participant.
- American Political Science Association Research Support Advisory Committee, 2000-2002.
- Advisory/Editorial board service (current and past), *Encyclopedia of Social Science Research Methods*; *American Journal of Political Science*; *Election Law Journal*; *Journal of Politics*; *Political Research Quarterly*; *Political Analysis*; *American Politics Research* formerly *American Politics Quarterly*; *Political Behavior*; *Journal of Election Technology and Systems*.
- Executive Council Representative, Western Political Science Association, 1998-2001.
- Book series co-editor, *Techniques of Political Analysis*, published by the University of Michigan Press, 1998-2003.
- Book series co-editor, *Analytical Methods for Social Research*, Cambridge University Press, 2003-present.
- Best paper prize committee chair, *Political Research Quarterly*, 2002.
- Program Committee and Comparative Politics Section Chair, 2000 Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting.
- Program Committee and Issues in Methodology Section Chair, 1999 Western Political Science Association Annual Meeting.
- Political Methodology Section (APSA) Publications Committee, 1997.
- Political Methodology Section (APSA) Nominations Committee chair, 1998.
- ICPSR Summer Program Advisory Committee, 1998.
- Political Methodology Section (APSA) delegate-at-large to the American Political Science Association, 1996 to 1998.
- Instructor, American Political Science Association Annual Meetings Short Course, “Models of Political Choice”, 1997.
- Instructor, ICPSR Summer Program in Quantitative Methods, Advanced Maximum Likelihood, August 1998; August 1997.
- Instructor, ICPSR Summer Program in Quantitative Methods, Maximum Likelihood, July 1996.
- National Election Studies 1996 Planning Committee Member.
- “Campaigns and the Study of Congressional Elections”. Memorandum to the NES Board of Overseers, September 5, 1995.
- “Survey Measures of Uncertainty: A Report to the NES Board on the Use of ‘Certainty’ Questions to Measure Uncertainty About Candidate Traits and Issue Positions,” Memorandum to the NES Board of Overseers, January 1996.
- Program Committee and Political Methodology Section Chair, 1996 Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting.
- Co-editor, *The Political Methodologist*, Newsletter of the Political Methodology Section of the American Political Science Association, 1993-1996.
- Co-organizer, Southern California Political Economy Seminars, 1993 to 1995.
- Participant in the Annual Political Methodology Summer Conferences, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1996, 2000.
- Participant in the Methodological Advances in Comparative Political Economy Conference, April 1991.
- Manuscript reviews [partial listing]: *American Journal of Political Science*; *American Political Science Review*; *American Politics Review*; *American Politics Research*; *British Journal of Political Science*;

Canadian Journal of Political Science; The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics; Journal of Law, Economics and Organization; Journal of Politics; Journal of Theoretical Politics; Pacific Historical Review; Political Analysis; Political Behavior; Political Research Quarterly; Polity; Public Opinion Quarterly; Social Science Quarterly; State Politics and Political Quarterly.

- Book manuscript review [partial listing], University of Michigan Press, Harvard University Press, Princeton University Press, University of Chicago Press, University of Pittsburgh Press, Quantitative Analysis in the Social Sciences (Sage Publications), Cambridge University Press, State University of New York Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, Ohio State University Press.
- Project proposal reviewer, National Science Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Columnist (monthly), *Pasadena Star News*, Opinion/Editorial, 2006-2007.
- Columnist (biweekly), *Pasadena Weekly*, “From the Ivory Tower”, 1999-2000.
- Panelist, Pasadena Mayor Forum, March 3, 1999.
- Panelist, “Measuring Progress in Our Schools”, March 21, 2000.
- Member, Internet Voting Task Force, California Secretary of State’s Office, 1999.
- Panelist, National Science Foundation National Workshop on Internet Voting, October 2000.
- Consultant to: Duke University, Dean of Undergraduate Admissions (1988-90); Duke University, Law School Admissions (1990-91); State of California, Office of the Attorney General, *California Democratic Party vs. Jones* (1997); State of California, Secretary of State’s Office, *Open Primary Analysis* (1998); Knight-Ridder Newspapers, *Hispanic Voter Poll 2000*; O’Melveny & Myers, LLP, *Righeimer vs. Jones* (2000); City of Compton, *Bradley vs. Compton* (2001); State of California, Senate Democratic Caucus, *Cano vs. Davis* (2001); Demos, *California Votes: Election Day Registration in California* (2002); Greenberg, Quinlan, Rosner, (*Hispanic Voter Surveys*) (2004); Greenberg, Quinlan, Rosner (NARAL Pro-Choice American) (2004); The Mellman Group (Hispanic Voter Surveys) (2004); Special Advisor, Greenberg, Quinlan, Rosner (2004-2008); Demos, Election Day Voter Registration (2004-2012); Obama For America, Consultant (2011-2012); Pivotal Targeting, Co-founder and Special Advisor (2012-present); Analytics Media Group, Senior Advisor (2015-2016); 605 Senior Advisor for Research and Development (2016-2020).

[INSTITUTE SERVICE]

- Caltech First-Year Admissions and Financial Aide (FAFA) Committee, 2023-present.
- Caltech Athletics and Physical Education Committee, 2023-present.
- Caltech Conversations on Artificial Intelligence, “Combating Misinformation Online”, October 18, 2022. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ABgGWYcGd7U>
- Faculty Lecture for Caltech Freshman Orientation, “Can America Have a Safe and Secure Election?”, September 22, 2021.
- Caltech Data Analytics for Student Success Working Group, Chair, 2020-present.
- “2020 Election Debrief”, Caltech Center for Inclusion and Diversity, November 4, 2020.
- Caltech Advisory Committee on Student Admissions and Recruitment, 2020-2021.
- COVID-19 and Implications for Addressing Global Crises in Health and Sustainability, Economic and Political Implications for Renewals and Climate Action. Resnick Sustainability Institute, webinar.
- “Computational Social Science”, Caltech, October 30, 2019.
- “Election Security”, Caltech *Break Through on the Road: Los Angeles*, February 9, 2019.
- “2018 Election Debrief”, Caltech Center for Diversity, November 7, 2018.
- SURF Advisory Committee, 2017-2021.
- Faculty Liaison, Men’s Varsity Basketball Team, 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020, 2021-2022, 2022-2023, 2023-2024 seasons.
- “Post-Election Debrief”, Caltech Center for Diversity, November 9, 2016. Also presented on November 15, 2016, Caltech International Students Programs.
- Keynote address, “The Mentoring Effect: Conference on Mentoring Undergraduate Researchers.” May 26, 2016
- President’s Diversity Council, 2008-2014.
- Caltech Faculty Board, 2008-2011.
- Administrative Committee on Diversity and Minority Affairs, 2004-2007.
- The Friends of the Caltech Library “Focal Presentation”, September 27, 2004. “Voter Registration: Past, Present, and Future”.

- Division of Humanities and Social Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Political Science Search Committee Chair, 1993, 1994, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2005, 2014.
- Division of Humanities and Social Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Political Science Search Committee, 2001 to present.
- Division of Humanities and Social Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Social Sciences Strategic Planning Committee Political Science Search Committee, 2004.
- FACS Science Reporting Institute, Research presentations, June 2001, June 2002.
- SURF Seminar presentation, August 7, 1996; July 25, 2001.
- Research presentations to the Executive Council of the Caltech Board of Trustees, December 2, 1996; July 12, 2001.
- Discovery Weekend presentation, March 16, 2001.
- Division of Humanities and Social Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Division Library Committee, 1993.
- Hazardous Chemical Safety Committee, California Institute of Technology, 2000 to 2010.
- Computational Science and Engineering Committee, California Institute of Technology, 2000.
- Chair, Caltech Women's Center Advisory Board, 1998 to 2001. Women's Center Advisory Committee Member, California Institute of Technology, 1994 to 1998. Women's Center Advisor Board, Chair, 1998-2001.
- Ph.D. Advisor or Thesis Committee Chair, California Institute of Technology:
 - Fang Wang (Political Science, 1998)
 - Garrett Glasgow (Political Science, 1999)
 - Fred Boehmke (Political Science, 2000)
 - Tara Butterfield (Political Science, 2001)
 - Catherine Wilson (Political Science, 2002)
 - Carla VanBeselaere (Political Science and Economics, 2004)
 - Betsy Sinclair (Political Science 2007)
 - Delia Bailey (Political Science 2007; Co-chair)
 - Kyle Mattes (Political Science 2008)
 - Morgan Llewellyn (Political Science 2009)
 - Gabriel Katz (Political Science 2010)
 - Ines Levin (Political Science 2011)
 - Andrew Sinclair (Political Science 2013)
 - Jaclyn Kimble (Political Science 2014)
 - Allyson Pellissier (Political Science 2015)
 - Lucas Nunez (Political Science 2018)
 - Nicholas Adams-Cohen (Political Science 2019)
 - Seo Young (Silvia) Kim (Political Science 2020)
 - Yimeng Li (Political Science 2022)
 - Daniel Guth (Social Science 2023)
 - Daniel Ebanks (Political Science 2024)
 - Claudia Kann (Political Science 2025)
 - Zhuofang Li (Social Science 2025)
 - Jacob Morrier (Social Science 2025)
 - Mitchell Linegar (Social Science 2026)
 - Matthew Estes (Social Science 2026)
 - Ransi Clark (Social Science 2026)
- Dissertation Committee Member, California Institute of Technology:
 - Mark Fey (Political Science, 1994)
 - Jason Saving (Economics, 1995)
 - Michael Udell (Economics, 1995)
 - Micah Altman (Political Science, 1998)
 - Reginald Roberts (Political Science, 2001)
 - Valentina Bali (Political Science and Economics, 2001)
 - Elizabeth Penn (Political Science, 2003)
 - Kevin Roust (Political Science, 2005)
 - Sarah Hill (Political Science, 2007)

- Peter Foley (Political Science 2013)
- Samantha Myers (Economics 2015)
- Matthew Chao (Economics 2015)
- Welmar Rosado (Political Science 2017)
- Liam Clegg (Economics 2018)
- Mali Zhang (Economics 2018)
- Chujun Lin (Neuroscience and Cognitive Psychology 2019)
- Dissertation Committee Member, New York University, Marisa A. Abrajano (Political Science, 2005); New York University, Melanie A. Goodrich (Political Science, 2009); European University Institute, Andrea Calderaro (Political Science 2010); European University Institute, Kristjan Vassil (Political Science 2011); University of California, San Diego, Francisco Cantu (Political Science, 2013); University of New Mexico, Lisa Bryant (Political Science, 2014); University of New Mexico, Alex Adams (Political Science, 2019); American University, Simon Heuberger (Political Science, 2021); University of California-Irvine, Melina Much (Political Science, 2024).
- Sponsor, Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship, California Institute of Technology:
 - Andrew Koclanes and Ryan Hu (2024)
 - Shreya Nag, Sidd Shendrikar, Jamal Omosun (2023)
 - Sreemanti Dey, Niva Laurent and Patrick Lim (2022)
 - Sarah Hashash and Akshay Gowrishankar (2021)
 - Ben Juarez, Sara Kangaslahti, Kyle McGraw, Chase Pagon (2020)
 - Ethan Eason and Michelle Hyun (2019)
 - Spencer Schneider (2018)
 - Jackson Briones (2018)
 - Cherie Jia (2016)
 - Clare Hao (2016)
 - Sean McKenna (2014)
 - Susan Ballentine (2013)
 - Andrew Sinclair (2007)
 - Daniel T. Knoepfle and Erin Hartman (2006)
 - Daniel T. Knoepfle and Eugenia S. Iofinova (2004)
 - Melanie Goodrich (2002, 2003)
 - Betsy Sinclair (2001)
 - Neal Reeves (1999)
 - John White (1994)
 - Stacy Kerkela (1993)
- Alumni College presentation, June 22, 2000.
- Division of Humanities and Social Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Graduate Admissions Committee, 1993 to 1998, 2000, 2008. Committee Chair, 1996.
- Research presentation to the Caltech Associates, October 27, 1998.
- Social Science .01 Lecture, “Empirical Voting Models”, May 8, 1998.
- Director of Graduate Studies and Graduate Option Representative, Social Sciences, 1996 to 1998.

[RESEARCH AND TEACHING INTERESTS]

Computational social science, artificial intelligence, American voting behavior, campaigns and elections, American government, macro-political economy, positive theory/public choice, comparative politics, quantitative methodologies.

March 7, 2025